

V. 25  
204

"What We Seek Is the Reign of Law, Based Upon the Consent of  
the Governed and Sustained by the Organized Opinion of Mankind."  
—PRESIDENT WILSON

# The WORLD COURT

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRESS  
SUPPORTING A UNION OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONS

Vol. IV—No. 12

December, 1918

Twenty Cents

## LEAGUE OF NATIONS NUMBER

What Kind of a League of Nations Can the World  
Get from the Peace Conference, Where Pres-  
ident Wilson Stands for International Justice?  
Nicholas Murray Butler, David Jayne Hill, Wil-  
liam Howard Taft, General Smuts and Others  
on the League Movement • Control of World  
Trade Routes • Amazing Rise of Czecho-Slovak  
Independence • Luxemburg, the Alsace-Lor-  
raine of Belgium • The Chile-Peruvian Trouble

Published by

THE WORLD'S COURT LEAGUE, Inc.

Educational Building, New York City

# THE WORLD'S COURT LEAGUE, INC.

## INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President

- Dr. Aristides Agramonte, Habana, Cuba.
- Dr. Eusebio Ayala, Asunción, Paraguay.
- John Barrett, Director-General of the Pan-American Union, Washington, D. C.
- Dr. Antonio Batres Jauregui, El Presidente del Poder Judicial, Guatemala.
- Mr. George Louis Beer, 329 West 71st Street, New York City.
- M. Enrico Bignami, Villa Coenobium, Lugano, Switzerland.
- Dr. R. Brenes Mesén, Secretary of Public Instruction, San José, Costa Rica.
- Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, New York. President of the Council.
- Dr. W. Evans Darby, "Jesmond," 59 Norfolk Road, Seven Kings, Essex, England.
- Dr. M. Diaz Rodriguez, El Ministro de Fomento, Caracas, Venezuela.
- Professor Guglielmo Ferrero, Historian, Viale Machiavelli, No. 7, Florence, Italy.
- Dr. Edoardo Giretti, Deputy in Parliament, Briccherasio, Italy.
- Dr. Juan Silvano Codoi, Museo de Bellas Artes é Histórico y Biblioteca Americana, Asunción, Paraguay.
- M. Henri Golay, Secrétaire général du Bureau international de la Paix, Berne, Switzerland.
- Dr. Charles Noble Gregory, 1502 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.
- Dr. Alonso Reyes Guerra, San Salvador.
- Mr. Carl Heath, Parliament Chambers, Great Smith Street, Westminster, London, S. W., England.
- Mr. F. W. Hirst, 27, Campden Hill Square, W., London, England.
- Mr. John A. Hobson, 3, Gayton Crescent, Hampstead, N. W., London, England.
- Dr. William I. Hull, Professor of History and International Relations, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
- Dr. Toyokichi Iyenaga, Managing Director The East and West News Bureau, Woolworth Building, New York City.
- Jhr. B. de Jong Van Beek en Donk, 24 Raamweg, The Hague, Netherlands.
- Baron K. Kaneko, Tokio, Japan.
- Hon. W. L. McKenzie King, The Roxborough, Ottawa, Canada.
- Gen. F. D. Légitime, Port-au-Prince, Haiti.
- Dr. Magalhaes Lima, 92 Rua Larga de S. Roque, Lisbon, Portugal (Former Minister).
- Dr. Frederick Lynch, Secretary, The Church Peace Union, 70 Fifth Ave., N. Y. City.
- Dr. Francisco Manrique, Civil Engineer, Guayaquil, Ecuador.
- Hon. Theodore Marburg, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Dr. Rafael Montúfar, Villa Montúfar, Paramus Road, Ridgewood, N. J.
- Dr. Ernesto Nelson, Universidad Libre, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
- Dr. Otfried Nippold, Professor of International Law, Thun, Switzerland.
- Mr. Alex H. Nordvall, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Prof. L. Oppenheim, Whewell House, Cambridge, England.
- M. Paul Otlet, General Secretary of the Union of International Associations, 4, Rue Edouard VII., Paris, France.
- Sir George Paish, Limpsfield, Surrey, England.
- Sir Gilbert Parker, 20, Carlton House Terrace, London, S. W., England.
- Dr. Jules Prudhommeaux, General Secretary of the "Association de la Paix par le Droit," and of the European Bureau of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 8 Rue Jacques Boyceau, Versailles, France.
- Hon. Paul S. Reinsch, Ambassador, Legation of the United States, Peking, China.
- Dr. Charles Richet, Hospital No. 32, Côte-St. André (Isère) Paris, France.
- Hon. William Renwick Riddell, The Supreme Court of Ontario, Osgoode Hall, Toronto, Can.
- Dr. Dámaso Rivas, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Dr. Theodore Ruysen, Rue Monjardin, 10 Nîmes, France.
- Mr. Fernando Sanchez De Fuentes, Habana, Cuba.
- H. E. Baron Y. Sakatani, Koishikawa, Hara-machi, Tokio, Japan.
- Dr. Albert A. Snowden, 120 Broadway, New York City.
- Dr. Jokichi Takamine, Equitable Building, New York City.
- Judge William H. Wadhams, 126 East 80th Street, New York City.
- Hon. Edward Wavinsky, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Weardale, 3 Carlton Gardens, London, S. W., England.
- Prof. George G. Wilson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
- Mr. H. Charles Woods, 171 Victoria St., London, S. W., England.
- Mr. L. S. Woolf, Hogarth House, Richmond, Surrey, England.
- Mr. Israel Zangwill, Far End, East Preston, Sussex, England.
- Dr. E. E. Zeballos, Buenos Aires, Argentina.



# The World Court

Vol. IV, No. 12. Published monthly, \$2 a year, by The World's Court League, Inc., Educational Building, 2 West 18th Street, New York.  
Entered as second-class matter, July 31, 1915, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under Act of March 3, 1879.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS, DECEMBER, 1918

CHRISTMAS, 1918 . . . . .	704
EDITORIALS . . . . .	705
PRESIDENT WILSON: APOSTLE OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE	
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS MOVEMENT	
THE PEACE CONFERENCE AND AN EFFECTIVE LEAGUE OF NATIONS . . . . .	709
<i>By Nicholas Murray Butler</i>	
<i>Interview by Edward Marshall</i>	
PRESIDENT WILSON AND THE PEACE . . . . .	718
<i>By Edward L. Conn, Washington Correspondent</i>	
MORAL AGREEMENT OF FREE NATIONS . . . . .	720
<i>By David Jayne Hill</i>	
NEW PLATFORM OF THE LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE . . . . .	725
LEAGUE TO POLICE HALF THE WORLD . . . . .	726
<i>By William Howard Taft</i>	
OLD EUROPE DEAD: A NEW WORLD ORDER . . . . .	728
<i>By Lieut. Gen. Jan Christian Smuts</i>	
LLOYD GEORGE SAYS LEAGUE OF NATIONS IS ESSENTIAL . . . . .	730
LEAGUE OF FREE NATIONS ASSOCIATION . . . . .	731
STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES	
INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF WORLD TRADE ROUTES . . . . .	737
<i>By Calvin Tomkins</i>	
EQUALITY ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE ROUTES . . . . .	740
<i>By J. P. Chamberlain</i>	
THE RISE OF CZECHO-SLOVAK INDEPENDENCE . . . . .	743
<i>By J. F. Smetanka</i>	
LUXEMBURG, THE ALSACE-LORRAINE OF BELGIUM . . . . .	750
<i>By James Gustavus Whiteley</i>	
THE CHILE-PERUVIAN TROUBLE . . . . .	753
<i>By Alejandro Alvarez</i>	
PRESIDENT WILSON'S VICTORY ADDRESS . . . . .	757
PRESIDENT WILSON SPEAKS OF PARAMOUNT DUTY TO GO TO PARIS . . . . .	759
THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF WOMEN FOR PERMANENT PEACE . . . . .	761
<i>By Lucia Ames Mead</i>	
PROPOSED CHANGE OF NAME FOR NEW YORK PEACE SOCIETY . . . . .	763

1918-19, 9-28, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100

## Christmas, 1918

**H**AVE YOU MADE YOUR VICTORY GIFT  
TOWARDS THE EDUCATION OF YOUR  
NEIGHBOR in the Eternal Principles of  
Right and Justice upon which alone Enduring  
Peace may come to All Nations?

You can at least give Your Neighbor the opportunity to learn from **THE WORLD COURT MAGAZINE** every month during the coming critical year of the world's history

Multiply that Two-Dollar Neighbor by the number of World Neighbors you would like to reach with the Gospel of International Justice and Fair Dealing, and send your Christmas contribution to-day to the World Court League's Educational Fund



# THE WORLD COURT

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRESS

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY

THE WORLD'S COURT LEAGUE, INC.

EDUCATIONAL BUILDING, NEW YORK CITY

EDITORIAL STAFF

FRANK CHAPIN BRAY, EDITOR

SAMUEL T. DUTTON

C. CHARLES HODGES

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE

JAMES BROWN SCOTT

---

Subscription Price, Two Dollars a Year

Single Copies, Twenty Cents

---

Copyright, 1918, by The World's Court League, Inc.

*For delays in delivering magazines, owing to abnormal conditions of transportation and mail service, it is necessary to ask readers of THE WORLD COURT to make patriotic allowance.*

## PRESIDENT WILSON: APOSTLE OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

"LONG live the champion and apostle of international justice," said the Bretons of Brest in their memorial salute to President Wilson on his arrival at that harbor town. "Paris and France awaited you with impatience," said President Poincaré, in an address of welcome at the French capital, "they were eager to acclaim in you the illustrious democrat whose words and deeds were inspired by exalted thought, the philosopher delighting in the solution of universal laws from particular events, the eminent statesman who has found a way to express the highest political and moral truths in formulas which bear the stamp of immortality." There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of these tributes expressed with a felicity that the President's countrymen appreciate. But what really matters is that, in

this crucial period of decision among victorious allies, international justice, the highest political and moral truths, shall prevail.

"From the first, the thought of the people of the United States turned toward something more than the mere winning of this war," says Mr. Wilson to M. Poincaré. "It turned to the establishment of eternal principles of right and justice. It realized that merely to win the war was not enough; that it must be won in such a way and the questions raised by it settled in such a way as to insure the future peace of the world and lay the foundations for the freedom and happiness of its many peoples and nations." So does the President restate his view of "the great triumph for which every sacrifice was made" and the tasks of peace to which we turn again.

In his address to Congress before sailing abroad, President Wilson hailed "a peace secure against the violence of irresponsible monarchs and ambitious military coteries, and made ready for a new order, for new foundations of justice and fair dealing." He continued: "We are about to give order and organization to this peace, not only for ourselves but for the other people of the world as well, so far as they will suffer us to serve them." Then with fine inspiration he added, "It is international justice that we seek, not domestic safety merely." This is a fitting companion phrase to the immortal "What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind."

Ample opportunity for the discussion of the application of these principles to problem after problem will arise as peace negotiations proceed from month to month. It is clear, however, that European peoples feel that our President at the Peace Conference personifies the Soul of America—unselfish, freedom loving, unafraid, possessed of some sense of international duty as well as of national rights, ready to break traditional precedent if necessary to secure results not only in smashing an enemy but in establishing just and lasting peace conditions. The moral power of this position Americans cannot afford to weaken in the face of reactionary, selfish, aggressive forces which always clamor for spoils of war and privileges in peace.

## THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS MOVEMENT

NO reservation was stipulated by the allied governments in accepting President Wilson's point fourteen as one of the terms on which they have declared their willingness to make peace with Germany. Point fourteen reads: "A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political and territorial independence for great and small states alike."

This point, in the President's Mount Vernon address, became a call for "the establishment of an organization of peace which shall make it certain that the combined power of free nations will check every invasion

of right and serve to make peace and justice the more secure by affording a definite tribunal of opinion to which all must submit, and by which every international readjustment that cannot be amicably agreed upon by the peoples directly concerned shall be sanctioned." And, Lloyd George promptly said, "if the Kaiser and his advisers are prepared tomorrow to accept the conditions as stated" in that whole address, "he can have peace not only with America but with Great Britain and France."

In the Liberty Loan address of September 27 the President declared that the constitution of a League of Nations and the clear definition of



its objects "must be a part, in a sense the most essential part of the peace settlement itself." No special league or alliance within the family league could be allowed and economic exclusion must be reserved to the League itself as a measure of discipline or control.

Since the allied governments also accepted these later enunciations of the principles of settlement there is value in reviewing them as a background to the negotiations in Paris and the international debate now raging on the subject. Some importance, too, attaches to the fact of record that the German Government, under Chancellor Maximilian, accepted the fourteen points and subsequent presidential addresses without any reservations whatsoever as a basis for "peace negotiations" which first spelled surrender.

Over in Paris President Wilson has lost no time in speaking of the necessity for a league of nations, to render the repetition of the wrongs of this war impossible. To a socialist delegation he said:

"This has, indeed, been a people's war. It has been waged against absolutism and militarism, and these enemies of liberty must from this time forth be shut out from the possibility of working their cruel will upon mankind.

"In my judgment it is not sufficient to establish this principle. It is necessary that it should be supported by a cooperation of the nations which shall be based upon fixed and definite covenants and which shall be made certain of effective action through the instrumentality of a league of nations. I believe this to be the conviction of all thoughtful and liberal men.

"I am confident that this is the thought of those who lead your own great nation, and I am looking forward with peculiar pleasure to cooperating with them in securing guarantees of a lasting peace of

justice and right dealing which shall justify the sacrifices of this war and cause men to look back upon those sacrifices as the dramatic and final processes of their emancipation."

It is the fact, however, that peoples' organizations in all the warring countries have been quicker to commit themselves unreservedly to the League of Nations idea than national leaders, but there are signs that numerous leaders begin to see light through their doubts and sophistications.

Of course the mere phrase League of Nations will not bring justice and peace to war-worn mankind. Everything will depend upon what kind of a League of Nations the Peace Conference is able to frame and the nations are willing to approve. If President Wilson has a draft to offer it will be taken up on its merits. Hitherto he has not endorsed the platform of any one of the various voluntary organizations which have conducted educational propaganda in this country or abroad. But the discussion of principles involved in any effective league has undoubtedly prepared the way for better judgment upon whatever plans come to the front in peace negotiations.

Readers of *THE WORLD COURT MAGAZINE* have been constantly kept in touch with the views of leaders and organizations on this subject. Several of the most illuminating contributions toward intelligent understanding of the problem appear on following pages this month. In general it may be said that the war has produced two extreme wings of internationalists, one favoring an armed

league for repressing unruly nations, the other favoring class rule across all national lines. We do not expect the American delegates to the Peace Conference to stand for retrogression to the tyranny of the Holy Alliance, or to jump into Bolshevism.

Mr. Balfour, Secretary of Foreign Affairs, says a league is a vital necessity; the United States must bear a large share of the work; the league he favors is of the trustee variety. Lord Robert Cecil, formerly of the British Foreign Office, heads the British section on the League of Nations at the Peace Conference, and hopes to state the case "in favor of the greatest political and social reform it is possible to achieve in the interests of mankind." The British voluntary propaganda leagues have agreed to work together.

In France the voluntary parliamentary committee, led by M. Leon Bourgeois, emphasizes the idea of a "society" of nations rather than any forced type of league. The French Association for a Society of Nations with which the former premier is identified, passed the following resolutions, December 7, which Foreign Minister Pichon presented to Premier Clemenceau:

"The Allied nations each shall, before the negotiation of peace, openly and solemnly affirm the principles of justice and right for which they have fought and which they are determined to apply in the treaty.

"Conditions and fundamental regulations for the organization of a Society of Nations shall be settled; the Allies shall bind themselves to observe them among themselves forthwith and forever.

"The treaty of peace shall include the obligations to which the Allies submit for

the maintenance of peace, notably obligatory arbitration and limitation of armaments.

"A universal conference shall be held immediately after the treaty of peace is signed to establish the same regulations between all states called to form a part of the society of nations. This conference, after verifying the guarantees presented by each state, shall decide on the admission of the state into the society of nations."

This French plan further provides for a Council of Administration, and against any recalcitrant nation lists; first, breaking diplomatic relations; second, closing courts; third, economic blockade; fourth, joint military action. The principle of a Society of Nations Clemenceau agrees to place at the head of the French peace program.

In the United States, while war was on, most people apparently accepted the general idea of a League of Nations as a part of our great moral purpose to fight this time to make an end of such wars as far as possible. Defeat of Germany alone does not satisfy that fundamental American aspiration. Fear that the United States may be led to go too far in this matter is hardly well founded; the danger is that with the war strain over we shall be found unwilling to go far enough to make the most of the unprecedented opportunity for progress. Statesmen are wanted who are equal to the task of connecting up legitimate national aspirations with international working machinery for common welfare. An encouraging spirit of emphasizing a common purpose rather than differences in paper programs is being shown by various voluntary propagandist leagues in the United States.



# The Peace Conference and an Effective League of Nations

INTERVIEW WITH NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER BY EDWARD MARSHALL

The following enlightening analysis of the chief problems confronting the Peace Conference by President Butler of Columbia University first appeared in the *London Observer*, December 8. Cable despatches by Universal News Service to American newspapers from Paris falsely referred to it as a criticism of the President at the Conference. The *WORLD COURT MAGAZINE* publishes the important contribution to international thinking at this crucial period by permission of the Edward Marshall Syndicate, Inc.

THE American people approach the Peace Conference in a very fine and broadminded spirit but without understanding the specific policies which they should consider and support and without any commitments to such policies. The public statements of the President have been almost universally and perhaps purposely couched in vague and general terms and the more specific policies outlined by Senator Lodge were of course not advanced on behalf of the Administration.

"There are three general phrases that the American people have been hearing constantly. They are 'self-determination,' a 'League of Nations' and 'the freedom of the seas.' The first relates to the thousand-year-old problem of nationality; the second to the two-thousand-year-old problem of a better world-order; and the third to a specific and highly important item in that world-order.

"The American people believe in the self-determination of peoples and in the principle of nationality involving national consciousness and organization, national tradition and national economic life. For this reason they are ready to support

with complete unanimity policies permitting the Czecho-Slovaks, the Jugo-Slavs and the Poles to organize their own independent governments and to take their places in the family of nations. For this reason they have applauded the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France, they will support the return of northern Slesvig to Denmark, the return of the Trentino to Italy and of sectors of Macedonia, Thrace and Asia Minor, which have largely dominating Greek populations, to either the sovereignty or the jurisdiction of Greece.

"American opinion overwhelmingly favors Home Rule for Ireland, but the sober judicious majority would regard with dismay any attempted application to this problem of the principle of a self-determination which would disrupt or even weaken the British Empire, since in every case except as to the still unsolved problem of Ireland, the British Imperial system has been a veritable nest for the hatching out of new, free and self-governing peoples.

"So far as the principle of self-determination is concerned, therefore, American public opinion will be

neither timid on the one hand nor chauvinistic on the other.

"The possibility of a League of Nations has been discussed for centuries, and probably Metternich and Talleyrand thought that just such a League was being organized at the Congress of Vienna one hundred and four years ago. The foundations of that structure were insecure, however, for it was built on the shifting sands of reaction, of imperialism, of international rivalry and of military power.

"Thus far two general and very different notions as to the League of Nations have found currency: the one is that supported by orthodox socialists and has in mind the destruction of all the essential elements and characteristics of nationality in order to bring about what I have sometimes called a colloidal or jelly-like internationalism without real nations. This is the notion of the Lenines and Trotskys, of the Liebknechts and the I. W. W. sympathizers. The achievement of this ideal would bring civilization to an end, make order impossible, destroy liberty and put mankind back at the foot of the ladder from which it began to mount when the Roman Empire fell to pieces.

"The other notion of the League of Nations involves what I have called crystalline or true internationalism. In this each nation remains self-conscious, self-determined and ambitious in its own right, and takes its place in a new international structure as an independent element—like a single crystal in an ordered group of crystals.

"In this case the group or league becomes stronger or more powerful according as the nations that compose it become stronger and more powerful.

"True internationalism must be built on the union of strong and self-respecting nations. False internationalism would weaken or destroy together those nations which accept it.

"The American people will have nothing to do with the false internationalism of Lenine and Trotsky, Liebknecht and the I. W. W. They know perfectly well that these men are enemies of a democratic republic, whether in Russia, Germany or the United States. On the other hand, the American people will support, not with unanimity, by any means, but by a substantial majority, a well-considered and thoroughly practical project for a League of Nations which shall be based upon the principles of true internationalism.

"There are those who urge that the example of the Constitution of the United States should be followed in organizing this League, that precise and definitive articles of government should be adopted, that an international legislature, executive and judiciary, should be erected, and that the part of the nations in the new organization should be similar to that of the States in the United States.

"There are two difficulties in the way of so ambitious a program. The first is that the public opinion of the world is not ready to support



it, and the second is that some of the necessary conditions of success which were present in the case of the United States, would be lacking in the case of such a League of Nations. The United States met with a century of difficulties in spite of unity of language, unity of tradition and unity of legal system. These three vitally important unities would be lacking in a League of Nations which should take the United States as its model.

"The true analogy between the United States and a League of Nations lies not on the surface, but deeper. It is found in the principle of federation with its accompanying characteristics of legal and economic cooperation. American opinion is ready for this if it be guided by a policy of lofty patriotism, broad international service and sincere democratic feeling.

"What the American people are asking to-day is this: Given conditions as they now exist in the world, how shall we proceed to form an effective League of Nations? This question the head of the American government has not attempted to answer. The most practical procedure appears to be the following: the Allied Powers which have won the war have been for the purposes of war, and at the present moment are, a League of Nations. They have unified their international policies. They have put their armies and their navies under single commands; they have pooled all their resources in shipping, food, munitions and credit. Let these nations, assembled by their representatives

at Versailles, declare themselves to be a League of Nations organized for the precise purposes for which the war was fought, and with which their several people are entirely familiar, namely the definition and protection of standards of international obligations, and the right of the smaller and less numerous peoples to be free from attack or domination by their larger and more powerful neighbors.

"As a beginning nothing more is needed. There is no necessity for an international constitution, no necessity for an elaborate international government machine, in order that the great enterprise may be launched. So far as these may be needed, they very well may come later.

"The second step should be to invite those nations that have been neutral in the war to join the League on condition that they formally give adhesion to the three ends or purposes for which the League is organized.

"The third step should be to invite the recently submerged and oppressed nationalities to present before the League their several cases for hearing and determination. When these have fully shown the basis of their geographical and political claims, and when the League of Nations has been satisfied as to the justice of these claims, then the petitioners should be invited to form their own government; and when they have done so, they should be admitted to the League of Nations as independent units.

"While this process is going on

and so long afterwards as may be necessary, Germany and Austria-Hungary and the German and Austro-Hungarians have washed from their hands the blood of Belgium and Serbia, have really repented for such crimes as the "*Lusitania*" and "*Sussex*," and have exorcised the evil spirits that have possessed them, then and then only should Germany and Austria-Hungary be taken back into the family which they jointly attempted to murder.

"I see no practical way other than this in which any headway can be made with regard to the project for a League of Nations. If there be an attempt to build it on the foundation of sentimentality or artificiality or neglect of the obvious facts, the project will fail and one of the greatest opportunities growing out of the world war will be lost.

"The resumption of the work of Hague Conferences and the building of an international judicial and economic structure would follow the foundation of such a League as I suggest as a matter of course and in due time.

"The American public is wholly mystified as to what is meant by 'freedom of the seas.' That phrase had a pretty definite meaning as late as the time of the American Civil War, but subsequent events have deprived that meaning of much significance. In time of peace the seas are and long have been entirely free. In time of war they have always been commanded by the possessor of the strongest navy. If that condition had not prevailed in 1914 Germany would have won the war just ended

within twelve months from the time of its beginning. With Germany's army in a position to do as it chose, and the naval hands of Great Britain and France tied behind their backs, the issue raised by Germany on August 4, 1914, would not long have remained uncertain. The mastery of the seas by the British Navy has proved to be the most powerful single element in bringing about the downfall of militarism.

"The world realizes that fact, and will not support any proposal which would change this condition in essence, although it may do so in form. Unquestionably the Allies have good reason to approve these conditions on the sea which just now have prevailed.

"The cowardly and wicked use of the submarine by Germany was the greatest menace to the freedom of the sea that history records. The Barbary pirates and roving privateers were negligible when compared with the submarines. If the phrase 'freedom of the seas' has to do with access to navigable waters by landlocked people or with unprivileged use of international straits, waterways and canals, well and good. American opinion will support 'freedom of the seas' when used in such a sense.

"The American heart has been touched by this war as never before. The sufferings and sorrows, the patience and endurance, the heroism and sacrifice of the Allies, particularly of France and Great Britain, have stirred America to the depths. The American people realize that the difficulties of peace are to be quite

comparable to the dangers and disasters of war, and that where the ruling principles are to have so many and so important concrete illustrations, there naturally will arise differences of opinion more or less open. The American people will remember the similar difficulties and conflict that arose between wholly patriotic and high-minded men in our own country at the close of our

American Revolution and again at the close of our Civil War. We of the United States shall be patient and endeavor to see beyond and behind these superficial conflicts, first, because our people understand Europe as they never did before, and second, because we are bound to the victorious peoples of Europe by stronger and more affectionate ties than ever have existed in the past."

---

## President Wilson and the Peace

---

By EDWARD L. CONN

*Correspondent of THE WORLD COURT MAGAZINE at Washington, D. C.*

THERE is a widespread misapprehension concerning the rôle President Wilson is to play at the Peace Congress. The two most divergent opinions are that he will seek to control it and, willy nilly, dictate the treaty; and that he will present a sorry spectacle, seeing his splendid ideals go glimmering the way of the mirage. It would not be inexact to say that President Wilson will be the dominating figure at the councils. It would not be accurate, however, to assert that he has gone to Paris with the purpose of dominating them. He has gone as the best qualified person to interpret his oft-reiterated principles of peace, which all the belligerents accepted as a basis for the negotiations, and he has gone to the conferences with an open mind in respect of the needs of Europe, albeit without any thought of compromise or trade.

It is inevitable that President Wilson, after conversing intimately with the heads of the Allied Govern-

ments, will undergo a modification of his views upon many subjects; it is not too much to expect, either, that the European statesmen will learn something from President Wilson; but those who predict a disastrous schism, if the best-informed persons here may be believed, will be undeceived; no matter what the treaty of peace may be, there is not one of the associated Governments, including that of the United States, which can afford to revolt against the verdict of the world. The Powers are sitting in judgment; from their decisions there can be no appeal.

The conferences have already begun. These preliminary exchanges of views will be fruitful of the peace itself. The sessions are, of course and necessity, conducted in camera. From time to time, reports of progress will be made, and there is only seemingly a repugnance in this procedure to the insistence upon a covenant of peace openly arrived at. There would be a babel of counsel

and of confusion were the discussions conducted, as it were, in the press of the world. It is sufficient that there can be no ratification of the treaty until each sovereign people shall have sanctioned it.

It may be that the world has been swept too far by the eloquence and idealism of President Wilson—that is, the popular imagination of the world. It has had the vision and believes in a new order. But it might be as incorrect to say that the Allied nations have changed heart as a result of this war as to say that Germany has changed heart. There are those who question if America really has been converted to the doctrines so admirably conceived and expressed by President Wilson. Undeniable evidence of the fundamental change in the Allied nations would be their renunciation of the advantages guaranteed to each under the provisions of the Treaty of London. Up to this time, neither England, France nor Italy has denounced that pact. The American press and some eminent American leaders have taken an Allied, rather than a Wilsonian view of the kind of peace that ought to be declared. Unfortunately, President Wilson appeared to make his peace program an issue in the last elections, and the country returned a Republican Senate as well as a Republican House. It seemed as if Americans had feared President Wilson was proposing, in his treatment of the German request for an armistice, an inconclusive peace. The Administration failed to acquaint the people with the real proposal—an

armistice that resembled more an unconditional surrender. It would be academic to speculate upon what the result of the election might have been had the people been taken more into the confidence of the Government, but the fact is that President Wilson goes to Europe and to the peace conference weakened in prestige, in the opinion of his critics.

No body of men ever assembled upon this earth has had entrusted to it greater responsibilities than those men, now in Paris, who are undertaking to reconstruct Europe, to decide the fate of Russia, Asia Minor, Persia, China, and enemy colonies in Africa and in the Pacific; to establish new rules for the conduct of nations, to prescribe the rights of peoples on the high seas, including the use of waterways; and to create a League of Nations.

President Wilson's formula for the peace is one of justice. That would seem to be simple enough. It is not clear whether Europe conceives justice in like manner as Mr. Wilson does, but if Europe does not, it cannot rightly be blamed. It might not appear to Americans to be "just," for instance, for the peace congress to award the Eastern Adriatic coast and littoral to Italy; but, on the contrary, it would not seem just to Italy if the congress deprived her of the natural defense of her Adriatic shores and of the Adriatic itself. The illustration is an excellent one to show where there may be clearly defined divergencies between the European and the American viewpoints. The Jugoslavs, who desire



to become a strong Power through the union of Serbia, Croatia and Dalmatia, naturally demand that Dalmatia be yielded to them. They claim a preponderance of the population. Italy sees as great a necessity for her to possess the Eastern Adriatic shores, allowing the new Yugoslav State outlets to the sea, as England sees in the retention of Ireland, which gives her control of the Atlantic routes and is the heart of Britain's sea-power; as the United States sees in the retention of the Hawaiian Islands, which afford protection to the Panama Canal as well as to the American Pacific coast, not to mention the Philippines; and Italy has certainly a more just claim to the Eastern Adriatic shore than England has to Gibraltar. The Italian shores on the Adriatic afford no natural defenses, and Italy can never be secure from attack there without possession of the natural defensive positions and the islands on the eastern side of that sea. An argument which Italy may employ at the peace congress is that the Yugoslavs, now entirely freed of the Hapsburg and Magyar tyrannies, might still be an oppressed people had not Italy fought to liberate them. The disputes which have been aired in respect of the disposition of the territories in question reveal that there is little affection on the part of the Yugoslavs for Italy, and one of the wild, fantastic reports current is that France particularly is fostering the Yugoslav demands in order that there might be erected beyond Italy a potent, populous, advantage-

ously-positioned ally which could be depended upon to respond to a summons to come to France's aid if at some future time there should be war between the two greatest Latin Powers.

It would be erroneous to suppose that President Wilson is ignorant of the contentions or of the merits on each side. He is uncommitted to any Government: he is only committed to the principles he has enunciated and to their proper application in the peace treaty. He expects to hear impartially the case of every claimant, and to speak for the United States in giving his countenance to or disapproving of the settlements proposed. President Wilson is plain-spoken; and if he has seemed unclear or ambiguous in his pre-armistice addresses, he will be to the point at the congress, as he is now in those preliminary discussions which will give chart and compass to the congress. It is well, however, to disabuse one's mind of any thought that President Wilson has gone to Paris with a chip on his shoulder and a stone in his pocket; or that he has gone there to salvage what he might from the possible foundering of his peace structure. He has gone because it was necessary, first, to counsel with the heads of the Entente Governments, where mutual modifications of views must inevitably take place; and, secondly, to represent the tide of American public opinion in its meeting the tide of European public opinion, as represented by European statesmanship, which, unlike American statesman-

ship, is of traditional, rather than spontaneous character; it is rooted in the bedrock of systems, like the balance of power and control of the seas, and it is difficult for such statesmanship to square itself and its practices with new ideas. President Wilson, in knowing this, is not stirred to fiery antagonism against that statesmanship; he is aware his principles are capable of many constructions, and it is his desire that the peace congress place the best constructions upon them which he is capable of persuading the congress to accept. What at one time was a slogan for the Allies, making the world safe for democracy, means as much to-day, but events in Russia particularly, and in Germany and Austria-Hungary and some of the Allied countries also, tend to cast some discredit upon it. There is genuine apprehension in Continental Chancelleries about making democracy safe for Europe. Democracy has been, perhaps, too much of a catch-word; pure democracy in the United States would be unconstitutional. Where it is sought to be practiced in Europe, chaos and anarchy have resulted. In its more limited sense, democracy has come into its own, but to unaccustomed peoples, it is leading, where it has not already led, to Bolshevism. This fact will confront President Wilson at Paris.

Those who are excited over the kind of peace that the world is to get would do well to review the past. As no peace ever has been perfect, as no peace ever has satisfied all con-

cerned, even as no alliance has ever left every member free of real or imagined mistreatment, so the coming peace will be open to criticism from every quarter, from every country. Belgium, which has been, together with France, the rallying name in the war, is said to wish to annex not only the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, but also Dutch territory along the Scheldt. Possibly as idle may be the report that France now desires to have the German provinces on the left bank of the Rhine erected into a buffer State allied to France. It is alleged that France and England are disputing over the division of Turkish territories. It is no longer imagined that the German colonies will be returned to Germany, and the only alternative to Britain receiving them would be their internationalization. America does not want them or any other spoil of the cataclysm. Educated under the pure sentiments of President Wilson, the very suggestion of this country receiving anything material out of this war is distasteful; and its proposal would cause a revulsion of feeling, as though the Allied nations had cynically doubted the professed reasons for which we entered the war, which were not related to any material gain.

President Wilson will not delay to make America's position well understood: it is that Germany's defeat being accomplished, the foremost problem is solved; the next question is how to arrange the international system so as to make impossible the recurrence of such a catastrophe.

A careful study of the President's original fourteen and subsequent points makes plain his conviction that, if the peace is to endure, and is not to be disrupted by the hazards of ordinary diplomacy and international dealings, there must be set up an institution called a League of Nations, whereby nations will be obliged to submit their disputes to a world court for adjudication. In appearance, and especially to the lay mind, the plan is simple enough and practicable; but the lay mind, and in particular the American mind, cannot easily grasp and comprehend the difficulties that lie in the way of creating such a League, which are a matter of course to the European understanding. Therefore, it is not a perfect League of Nations which will be established by the Powers in conference at Paris; it will not even be a perfectly created and empowered international tribunal, for the Great Powers grouped in the European hemisphere are confronted by problems and conditions which are unknown, or if known, are not appreciated, in America. President Wilson has spoken against the system of the balance of power, against treaties of alliance; but both the system of the balance of power and treaties of alliance will persist. Indeed, the rearrangement of the map of Europe and the realignment of States are already in process, and it is most improbable that Japan, the cornerstone of whose foreign policy is the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, will abandon that alliance, or that Great Britain, despite the momentary in-

capacity of Russia, will see no need for its prolongation. But the failure of the President to exact the fulfilment of his hopes in respect of the balance of power and of international alliances will not prevent the creation of the proposed League of Nations, with its central idea of a world court, the creation of which, together with the definitive defeat of the Central Powers and their allies, will well repay America for her contribution to the war. And should there be any who fears that the Entente nations have deceived or might deceive the United States in the peace-making, he may reflect upon the naval policy of this country, which will put America in a position to look the world in the eye and speak its mind, be the world sympathetic or hostile; and he may reflect also upon the economic strength of these States, which compels the world to pay tribute. The sea-power and the economic wealth of the United States will play their important part in the shaping of the peace; England, France, Italy and the lesser Allied nations will come to Washington for credits, and the whole world henceforth, if any nation thinks of war, will look to the United States before taking a precipitate step.

There is no intention on the part of the Allies to trick, deceive or injure the United States; to attempt either would react against those guilty. The European statesmen desire, as earnestly as President Wilson himself, to effect a just peace; it may be, however, that European

practices, sanctioned by long custom, have warped their ideas of justice; and that European necessities have not permitted of exact equalities of right as between nations. It is the purpose of President Wilson to reconcile the European and American conceptions, not by compromise, but by the practical application to international practice of those principles of justice based on the natural rights of man, rather than upon the theory that the instinct of man is to fight his fellow-man. Peace, not war, must be the rule now; the day when war was the pastime of either kings or nations must be ended.

There have been efforts to make it appear that some of the Allied Governments have entered into secret agreements or understandings since the United States entered the war with the object of safeguarding their own selfish interests at the cost of those principles of justice which President Wilson has proclaimed. All such reports are wholly discredited by the highest officials here. It is known to the American Government that for the past two years the Allied Governments have been most punctilious in their desire to do nothing without the full knowledge and approval of America, and such arrangements or reservations as have been made and which, like the Allies' declination to subscribe to the principle of the freedom of the seas, have been made in public view. There is no justification, in the opinion of officials here, of any suspicion that the Entente Powers have

"framed up" the peace congress and that President Wilson will come out of it a wiser if disillusioned man.

The peace will not be perfect; no merely human effort can be perfect in its achievement, and the temptations to the Powers as well as to the smaller nations, including those which are to be created with the sanction of the congress, will be too great to warrant the expectation that all the advantages which the defeat of the Central Empires put at the disposal of the Allies will be rejected, even if those advantages take the form of territorial accessions. The age-long conflict between neutral and belligerent will not find a wholly satisfactory solution at the hands of the congress. This is made patent by the national determination of Great Britain not to subscribe to any principle that threatens to weaken her sea-power or the efficiency of her great navy. The laws of neutrality, therefore, will receive chief attention in the direction of neutral duties rather than of neutral rights, although President Wilson on every occasion, either in person or through the American delegates, will champion the neutral cause, because it is the will, real as well as traditional, of the United States not to involve itself in foreign wars, and it is the determination of this country not to submit to unjust and unwarranted restriction of its rights as a neutral. At one time the chief distinction made by the American Government in respect of the violation of its neutral rights by England by Germany was that



the former stopped short of the taking of American lives.

The suggestion of Viscount Grey, former British Foreign Minister, that the solution of the problem of freedom of the seas may be found in the settlement of the league of nations question was believed in diplomatic quarters here to point the way to an acceptable, if not altogether satisfactory, reconciliation of the view of the United States, which has championed the free seas proposal, with that of Great Britain, which claims a right to rule the seas in the interest, it is declared, of humanity. It is evident that England will not consent to the institution of a tribunal for the trial of disputes between nations unless the laws which that court shall apply are known, that is to say, unless the rules are codified. Because there was a want of such generally recognized naval rules, Great Britain refused to ratify the Hague Convention providing for the creation of an international prize court; and even when the foremost authorities of the maritime Powers met in conference in London, upon the invitation of the British Government, England again failed to ratify the rules as codified by the London Conference. The situation is so different to-day, however, that the world public opinion will not tolerate a similar failure, and to this end it is believed that the league of nations project as formulated by President Wilson and his advisers provides not only for a court, but also for a legislative

body and an administrative institution, or executive, as well. If this is really the President's plan, the work of the peace congress will be materially shortened, as there could be referred to it not only the majority of problems relating to international law and procedure, the former of which would be codified and the latter proclaimed by the league itself, but also an infinite number of secondary problems which, if the peace congress itself should be obliged to solve, would protract its sessions unduly.

Great things, well worth the sacrifices made by America and the Allies, will come out of the peace congress. The world has been made free, and what is also of paramount importance, the public opinion of mankind, of every race and tongue, has become a bulwark against future wars. International aggressions will not hereafter be undertaken with impunity, if attempted at all. Diplomacy will continue to play its game according to the lights of those conducting it, special advantages will be sought, and altruism is not expected to be the controlling principle, but there will be less injustice, and more to be considered than ever before, there will be the United States, which has shaken off its cloak of isolation, drawn its sword in defense of right, and which must enter into any equation whenever if ever another Power, or group of Powers, sets out to disturb the peace of the world.

# Moral Agreement of Free Nations

By DAVID JAYNE HILL

*Ex-Minister of the United States to Switzerland and the Netherlands, Ex-Ambassador to Germany, American delegate to the Second Hague Conference, author of "The Rebuilding of Europe" and many other volumes.*

Here are presented only the concluding paragraphs of Dr. Hill's timely article, "The Entente of Free Nations," which is to appear in *The North American Review* for January. He holds that no theorist at this time should be regarded as a trustee of the whole people in so important a matter as a particular scheme for a League of Nations. He pleads for intelligent study and common counsel and progress on the basis of moral rather than legal unity. Every serious student of this question will wish to read Dr. Hill's complete article in *The North American Review*.

**I**N proportion as they become republican, as Kant contends,

States may find it easier to combine in federations than was the case with absolute monarchies; still, even republics are jealous of their sovereign powers, and they are not disposed lightly to surrender them. Every scheme for a League of Nations requires this surrender in some degree, for every such league creates in some form a supernational body of control, to which the members agree to submit. Membership in such a league, of necessity, implies the renunciation of any independent foreign policy.

In a world composed of nations varying in culture, character, education, and honor, as well as in numbers, strength, and military traditions, such a renunciation cannot wisely be made without unusual assurances, and it cannot be universal. If made at all, it must be made for the sake of advantages not otherwise attainable, and for an association that is beyond suspicion. A league which had for its object to enforce peace, without specific foreknowledge of the occasions that might call for its exercise of the war-making power, could not be wisely created except

between nations of the highest moral responsibility and mutual confidence, and could never safely be allowed to include any nation that could not be trusted to accept and obey the decisions of a tribunal to which it might consent to submit a difference.

A league professing to be composed only of "free nations" would rest upon a basis of an extremely ambiguous character. What nations are to be classed as "free"? Certainly no nation that holds in subjection any people not permitted to enjoy self-government. And the mutability of nations must not be overlooked. The expression "free nations" is especially equivocal in a period of revolution and transition, like the present. Neither Russia, nor Austria-Hungary, nor even Germany could claim a place in it, nor could the fragments into which they may possibly fall before the movements of revolt or secession are completed. And what is to be said of the suppressed nationalities which are aspiring to independence but have not yet attained it?

Is it not a little singular that the course of events and the effort to control them by general principles

should have led men to claim that the coming peace should include such logical antinomies as a partial renunciation of national sovereignty and the complete attainment of self-determination?

The origin of the problem is more evident than its solution. On the one hand, some nations are regarded as too independent, too powerful, and too aspiring, to be considered safe for the rest of the world, unless they are willing to have imposed upon them certain restraints which equality seems to require; while, on the other, some nations are too much oppressed, too feeble, and too inconclusive, to assert the national rights which even-handed justice would assign to them.

We are here confronted with the indisputable fact of the natural inequality of nations, and this disparity extends to every circumstance of national life, except one. Juristically, all independent and responsible States, whether large or small, have equal abstract rights to existence, self-preservation, self-defense, and self-determination; but culturally, economically, and potentially, they are, and must remain, unequal. If they enter a "League of Nations," they must enter it upon terms which the strong are disposed to grant to the weak and which the weak are obliged to accept from the strong. It is evident who will make the laws. But if self-determination is a right, and its realization is possible only through the exercise of force, who shall say that a suppressed nation may not plan and achieve its own de-

velopment, as the greater States have done? Shall the great empires impose upon the world an unchangeable status of their own devising; or shall the Balkan States, for example, agree upon their own boundaries and affiliations?

The problem of adjustment is further complicated by the fact that the modern nation is no longer a merely juristic entity, having for its only object the maintenance of order and justice among its own inhabitants. It has become an economic entity, a business corporation, looking for markets for its commodities and for raw material from which to manufacture them. The State owns mines, railways, steamships, colonies, and uses them as means of increasing its own power of control over the products and the markets of the world. Will it open its house to the passerby, invite him to its banquet-board, and share with him its accumulated treasures?

This is a question which time will answer. And a very short time has sufficed for a partial response. Every one of the Powers is now planning how it may increase its trade, and how it may extend its control over natural resources.

In so far as the object of a "League of Nations" is to prevent this rivalry from becoming dangerously acute, its purpose is no doubt commendable; but the danger it involves is that, in striving to enforce a legal compulsion, it may be felt to be oppressive,—a new type of multiplex imperialism in place of the old. In one respect, at least, this danger

is imminent. If a "League of Nations" proves to be a device to compel independent nations to make economic sacrifices for the benefit of others, and establishes a central control of resources which becomes a dispenser of benefits which the beneficiaries have not aided in creating, then the League will prove a bondage that will be resented, and will not be endured. It is very appealing to our better natures to inform us that the future is to be "a life of service," in which we must perform a generous part. If this is voluntary, the call may well be a spur to action. But if the "League of Nations" aims to obtain these sacrifices, not by such voluntary action as the associated nations have freely offered to one another during the period of war, by supplies of food, loans of money, free medical service, and gifts of a magnitude which the world has never before known, but by the enforced operation of a legal contract, the call is different. In one scheme at least the world's supplies, the world's credit, and the world's military strength, in the name of equal economic opportunity together with the "freedom of the seas," whatever that may mean, are to be placed under the control of a central authority,—an International Ministry or Council of Delegates, whose decisions shall be paramount and final in the great questions of trade and war.

England cannot surrender her defense of the sea, nor France be forced into economic community with a convicted burglar, nor America obliged to open her ports on conditions im-

posed by a supranational control predominantly composed of foreign representatives.

If nations had not developed into business corporations, and had confined their activities to the realm of protecting the rights of their individual citizens, a "League of Nations" might have meant something quite different from this. Laws of a universal character might have been readily assented to for the uniform protection of individual persons which it is now difficult for sovereign powers to accept as applying to themselves. This is particularly true when international restraints are directed against perfect freedom in national fiscal policy. No nation whose citizens are required by their habits and climate to maintain a high standard of living, or suffer deterioration by lowering it, can afford to bind itself to grant equal terms to imports, especially manufactured articles, from all countries alike. They would soon find their working classes reduced to starvation wages accompanied by the total paralysis of many lines of industry as a consequence of an enforced competition with lower races, living in climates and under conditions where the customary standard of life can be maintained at a trifling cost, while foreign employers were reaping rich harvests of profit by exploiting practically subject peoples.

Under such a régime, the people of the United States would suffer more than any others, for the reason that their standard of living is the highest in the world. It is on this account



that, by voluntary sacrifice, the United States has been able to rescue from starvation and to supply with needed commodities the impoverished nations of the world. This has been one of their chief contributions to the Great Understanding, the Entente of Free Nations, in saving from ruin the countries overridden by centralized economic power. It has been possible because personal initiative and enterprise, protected and left free to achieve its own development without absorption by the State, had accumulated forces and agencies which, being free, were in reality the most efficient in the world. Without that freedom and without that protection, the contribution of America in the war would have been impossible. Our country would have been in a state of colonial dependence upon the great manufacturing centers of the European nations.

Our interest and our policy are, therefore, plain; first of all, to hold fast to our freedom; and, next, to prevent from falling into desuetude that unwritten charter of union which constitutes the Entente of Free Nations, cherishing its unity of purpose as the most precious of human achievements. It is a moral, not a legal unity, that has given us the victory. Uncovenanted armies have gathered from every quarter of the globe to assert the determination of the free nations that the rule of arbitrary force shall be ended. Our sons and brothers have been among them. Together they have faced death and have shed their blood, and men of many nations sleep in com-

mon graves. It is the most splendid assurance for the peace of the world and the rule of justice that can be imagined. The sense of comradeship in a holy cause cannot perish. A new Brotherhood of Man has come into being. Let us not mar its simplicity by distrust or controversy, or try to force upon any of our cobelligerents any untried theory of legal union which might be honestly rejected, or accepted with doubt and reluctance. The battle has been fought in the name of freedom. Let us remain free in the hour of victory.

But in our freedom there are certain principles which must not and will not be forgotten. They will control the practice of the Entente of Free Nations, which must continue with its present provisions for conference, discussion, and united action. A marked step of advancement has been taken in the recognition of the principle that all international engagements and undertakings must be justified by the moral law and must have publicity. A formal covenant in this sense may be found possible, and it may take a solemn legal form; but, whether this be the case or not, the war has established a few precepts that will, undoubtedly, be admitted to a permanent place in the code of international right. No treaty between nations should be considered binding unless it is published when it is made. No negotiations affecting the destinies of peoples should be conducted without their knowledge of the fact and of the obligations to which they are to be committed. No war should

be begun without a public statement of the reasons for it and an opportunity for public mediation between the disputants, which should never be considered an offense. No territory occupied in war should be claimed by right of conquest without a public hearing of all who are affected by it.

The attempt to state these, or any, definite principles, illustrates how inadequate a strictly documentary form of engagement of necessity must be. It is, however, the spirit, not the form, that must be depended upon for the security which a formal treaty of alliance or an understanding can afford. The whole structure of international peace and justice rests upon the character of the peoples who form the Society of Nations. The Great War has subjected the combatants to a fiery test. It cannot well be doubted that the Entente of Free Nations will stand also the test of peace. A solidarity that has been only strengthened by the dangers of battle will certainly not be broken in the attempt to revise the Law of Nations, to make it the basis of clearer understandings, and

to increase the confidence with which the co-partners in victory will bring before the judgment bar of reason the differences that may tend to divide them. But the perfection of this understanding is a matter of growth and of gradual adjustment. What cannot be accomplished by a stroke of the pen at a given moment of time may prove an easy task if the spirit of the Entente, and especially the sense of freedom which brought it into being, can be retained and matured. But this can be done only by a renunciation of the desire to force any favorite plan to an issue within the Entente. For a considerable time, unless new dangers are to be incurred, armies and navies will be necessary to guard the peace that is to be signed at Versailles. It will be wise to maintain the supremacy of the forces that will have made it possible. For this the responsibility rests upon all, according to their strength. And because they are strong they may, by the constancy, justice, and unselfishness of their conduct, prove to all mankind that really free nations alone can preserve the peace of the world.

#### THE WORLD'S COURT LEAGUE

Favors a League among Nations to secure

1. An International Court of Justice established by a world conference and sustained by public opinion.
2. An International Council of Conciliation.
3. A World Conference meeting regularly to support the Court and Council, and to interpret and expand International Law.
4. A Permanent Continuation Committee of the World Conference.

# New Platform of the League to Enforce Peace

The Executive Committee of the League to Enforce Peace on November 23 adopted a new platform called a "victory program," which supersedes the win-the-war platform announced at the Philadelphia convention last May and the original draft of a platform, July, 1915. It is "offered for the consideration and endorsement of all organizations and individuals interested in the problems of international reconstruction." The new platform reads:

**T**HE war now happily brought to a close has been above all a war to end war, but in order to insure the fruits of victory and to prevent the recurrence of such a catastrophe there should be formed a League of Free Nations, as universal as possible, based upon treaty and pledged that the security of each state shall rest upon the strength of the whole. The initiating nucleus of the membership of the League should be the nations associated as belligerents in winning the war.

The League should aim at promoting the liberty and progress and the fair economic opportunity of all nations and the orderly development of the world.

It should ensure peace by eliminating causes of dissension, by deciding controversies by peaceable means, and by uniting the potential force of all the members as a standing menace against any nation that seeks to upset the peace of the world.

The advantages of membership in the League, both economically and from the point of view of security, should be so clear that all nations will desire to be members of it.

For this purpose it is necessary to create:

1. For the decision of justiciable questions, an impartial tribunal

whose jurisdiction shall not depend upon the assent of the parties to the controversy; provision to be made for enforcing its decisions.

2. For questions that are not justiciable in their character, a Council of Conciliation, as mediator, which shall hear, consider and make recommendations; and, failing acquiescence by the parties concerned, the League shall determine what action, if any, shall be taken.

3. An administrative organization for the conduct of affairs of common interest, the protection and care of backward regions and internationalized places, and such matters as have been jointly administered before and during the war. We hold that this object must be attained by methods and through machinery that will ensure both stability and progress; preventing, on the one hand, any crystallization of the *status quo* that will defeat the forces of healthy growth and change, and providing, on the other hand, a way by which progress can be secured and necessary change effected without recourse to war.

4. A representative Congress to formulate and codify rules of international law, to inspect the work of the administrative bodies and to consider any matter affecting the

tranquillity of the world or the progress or betterment of human relations. Its deliberations should be public.

5. An executive body, able to speak with authority in the name of the nations represented, and to act in case the peace of the world is endangered.

The representation of the different nations in the organs of the League should be in proportion to the responsibilities and obligations they assume. The rules of international law should not be defeated for lack of unanimity.

A resort to force by any nation should be prevented by a solemn agreement that any aggression will be met immediately by such an overwhelming economic and military force that it will not be attempted.

No member of the League should make any other offensive or defensive treaty or alliance, and all treaties of whatever nature made by any member of the League should at once be made public.

Such a League must be formed at the time of the definitive peace or the opportunity may be lost forever.

---

## League to Police Half the World

By WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT

*From an informal address by the President of the League to Enforce Peace to newspaper editors at the Lotos Club, New York, December 6.*

WE have made an armistice. We have imposed terms on Germany by means of that armistice, and it is to be expected that the terms of the treaty of peace will be based somewhat upon what is implied in that armistice. In general that basis has been laid down in the President's enunciation of his fourteen principles, and in the subsequent reservations of the Allied powers that they would have to deal with their own interpretation of the freedom of the seas and the question of restoration would have to include the paying of indemnities.

The question of secret or open diplomacy is easy or difficult, according to your temperament, but when you come to the question of arma-

ment, how are you going to arrange that? How much armament is each nation going to have?

How much armament is Germany to be allowed to have? Of course we are going to see that that is just as little as "domestic safety" requires. But are you going just to leave it in the treaty and not insure Germany's carrying it out? Or, assuming that Germany unites with German Austria and they become a fairly strong and militaristic nation, are we going to see that there exists machinery to make the covenant effective?

Now we come to the question of Germany's colonies. She has abused people in these colonies outrageously in some places. She has taken the Turk's attitude toward the Arme-



nians, which has been "solve the Armenian question by killing the Armenian people." Of course we can't return those colonies to Germany. Are we to give them to England, a pretty good colonizing nation, or to France? No, gentlemen, you can't do it. The only safe way to deal with that is through a League of Nations.

Next we come to Russia. She has the Bolsheviks. I don't know what we are going to do with her, though I do think we should have sent 200,000 men in there long ago, and they, in cooperation with the soldiers of our allied belligerents, could have dealt with the Bolsheviks. There is only one way to deal with people who say: "You are an encumbrance upon the earth; we shall kill you." That is to kill them first. Any other way is an iridescent dream. I believe the Germans are too well educated to be seriously infected with Bolshevism, but Bolshevism in Russia must be dealt with.

Now, in the Ukraine, in the Baltic Provinces, in Finland, and in Poland, we probably are going to establish four independent Governments. We already stand agreed to do it in Poland. We face many such rearrangements of small nations. We have got to establish some sort of Government in Constantinople and that little part of Thrace which remains with it; all that is left of Turkey in Europe. Are we going to let England and France do it? No, gentlemen, you have got to call on a League of Nations to carry out that enterprise.

The same is true of Palestine and

many other places. Your plan as agreed upon looks to the establishment of ten or twelve independent new republics, every one of which is absolutely without experience in self-government. You have got to divide the Balkans, and you know what experience we have had with the Balkans. To fix those boundaries and expect peaceful condition and absence of jealousy and friction is like tying two cats together and leaving them alone. It is not possible. These are the governments that we are to create. We have said so in our fourteen points, and the other nations have acquiesced to that extent.

I just want to ask the simple question, that, it seems to me, can be answered with mathematical accuracy: If we create those governments and leave them alone and go away without organizing the League of Nations to help them on as we have helped Cuba, have we made for war or made for peace? You carve them out of the old dominions, you create jealousies, you create the resentments with the old dominions; and it is not possible to maintain those purposes and carry them out unless you do have a League of Nations that shall remain together with a police force of very considerable size to see to it that these children of ours—for that is what they are—shall "shinny on their own sides." You can't apply this treaty, which must be as long as the moral law, unless you have a court authorized by your League of Nations to interpret it. You can't have these

nations get on in a friendly way unless you have a committee of conciliation to reconcile the differences that cannot be settled on principles of law. You can't have a conference of the powers like this and establish all these governments and all these rights of access to the sea that we see in the fourteen points and in other addresses unless you have in the action of the Congress of Nations new definitions of international law and almost a codification of it, because you are going into the question of the seas and the freedom of the seas and all that that means.

In other words, this treaty is impossible of execution—it is worth nothing but the paper it is written on—unless you continue an arrangement between the powers that in ef-

fect constitutes a League of Nations to enforce peace on half the world, in Middle Europe, all eastern Europe, Asia Minor, and Africa. Having done that, the step to the rest of the world is easy. It has only to introduce the same obligations *inter sese* that you impose by a treaty on the other half of the world. That is what a League of Nations is, and I don't see that the parties can any more escape it than a ferry boat's nose escapes getting where it belongs in the slip here. It hits first one side and then the other, and finally it gets in.

The Lord has delivered the opponents of the League into our hands. The war is a failure if we don't have it.

---

## Old Europe Dead: A New World Order

By LIEUT. GEN. JAN CHRISTIAN SMUTS

Addressing a party of visiting American editors in London on November 14, the famous South African general enhanced his reputation for farsighted liberal international mindedness in the following words:

**O**LD Europe is dead and a new world is slowly emerging. In the upbuilding of this new world the cooperation of America is essential. It is for the good of both America and Europe that the former henceforth take an active share in the councils of the Old World and take up her burden in world politics.

America has become jointly responsible with Europe for the new order which will arise from the ruins of this war. America and Great Britain are bound by the same great principles and ideals. Their close cooperation henceforth will form the

best guarantee for the future peaceful development of civilization.

When the great American Republic joined us in the struggle, it was not only with material weapons, but with all that moral reinforcement which came from the splendid vision and moral enthusiasm of President Wilson, speaking on behalf of the people of the United States. His was the great vision of a League of Nations, and our main concern now must be the saving of Europe for the future of the world. As we organized the world for victory, let us now organize the world against hunger. That will be the best prepara-

tion for the new order of international good feeling and cooperation.

The position is tragic in the extreme. A whole world order is passing away. There is danger of things going too far and giving Europe a setback from which she will not recover for generations. The evils bred by hunger threaten not merely the old institutions, but civilization. We saved the soul of civilization; now let us care for its sick body.

Not only the liberated territories of our Allies, not only our small neutral neighbors, but the enemy countries themselves require our helping hand. Let us extend it in all generosity and magnanimity. The idea of organizing food supplies for those lands will help to purify an atmosphere cursed with war, hate and untruth. It would all have been so much easier if Germany had fought a clean fight and not stained her hands with such crimes, but, even so, we must be influenced by the larger considerations.

We must feel that in the call to common humanity there are other purposes besides the prevention of war, for which a League of Nations is a sheer, practical necessity. One of the first steps must be to create an organization against hunger and ration all the countries where disaster threatens.

The existing Inter-Allied machinery, which is the nucleus of a League of Nations, probably will undertake this task. In the period of reconstruction after the war, all countries, Allied, neutral and enemy, will have to be rationed for certain raw materials. Here again international ma-

chinery is necessary. We thus are making straight for a League of Nations charged with the performance of these international functions.

Then, as regards the primary object of the league, from Finland to Constantinople, the map will be covered with small nations, divided by profound antipathies and most of them with minorities conducive to internal weakness. We may therefore expect more dangers of wars in Europe than in the past. Therefore, it is imperative that we create an international organization to keep peace.

The league also would be useful in solving other problems. For instance, when the league is established, America might be asked to act in some trouble in Turkey or Russia on behalf of the league, which would give her general directions. Or, take the case of the former German colonies. Some of them must fairly and properly be given to the British dominions who conquered them and for whose future development and security they are necessary. But there may conceivably be others which the Allies, while refusing to restore them to Germany, as they cannot foresee what course the future development of Germany might take, might transfer to certain powers until their ultimate disposal is settled.

Probably other knotty territorial problems could be deferred in the same way. The task will be as difficult as it is great, but where America joins hands with Europe and Great Britain in attempting to solve it, I

have no doubt a solution will be found.

The age of miracles is never past. The history of South Africa since the Boer war bears immortal testimony to the wisdom of a policy of conciliation. If the victors of this

greatest of all wars imitate the temper of Great Britain on that occasion, I have hope that the bitterness of this war may lead to a great reconciliation of peoples in the future, perhaps even to the disappearance of war.

### LLOYD GEORGE SAYS LEAGUE OF NATIONS IS ESSENTIAL

Discussing the question of a League of Nations on November 12, Premier Lloyd George said:

"Such a league is more necessary now than ever. The conditions which prevailed in the Balkans before the war are now affecting practically two-thirds of Europe. A large number of small nations have been re-born in Europe, and these will require a League of Nations to protect them against the covetousness of ambitious and grasping neighbors. In my judgment a League of Nations is absolutely essential to permanent peace. We shall go to the Peace Con-

ference to guarantee that a League of Nations is a reality. I am one of those who believe that without peace we cannot have progress. A League of Nations guarantees peace and guarantees also an all-round reduction of armaments, and that reduction of armaments is a guarantee that you can get rid of conscription here. Of course we must have in this country an efficient army to police the empire, but I am looking forward to a condition of things, with the existence of a League of Nations, under which conscription will not be necessary in any country."

"Sixty Years of American Life." By *Everett P. Wheeler*. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York.

This volume is valuable not only for its intrinsic merit but because it is unusual. Few men have been able to follow intimately the progress of affairs in America for sixty years and at the end of that time possess the power of perspective and the ability required to make a satisfactory report. Mr. Wheeler has been a lawyer of distinction, a close observer and has always held the attitude of the reformer and humanitarian. His treatment of the Civil War, and the period of reconstruction is most interesting and possesses a certain freshness which comes from insight and close acquaintance. With Mr. Wheeler American history is something more than a record of political events or even of those who have been our leaders. In this volume things are weighed and measured by moral standards. Sincerity and real worth are recognized and the aims which men have pursued touching the welfare of the people. So while we have a careful study of the currency, there is still more explicit treatment of civil service re-

form. The author has been an active participant in attempts to reform New York politics and lived to see a city, which when he first knew it, was acknowledged to be the worst in the United States, become, in the judgment of those competent to speak, the best governed. The author speaks interestingly of the Presidents he has known, and of the policies which made them regarded as benefactors of the nation. It is an interesting bit of history which reveals the part played by Mr. Roosevelt when the Trustees of the American College for Girls at Constantinople were seeking from the Sultan Abdul Hamid a clear title to the land upon which said college now stands. The closing chapter enumerates some of the social and economic changes made in sixty years. The author has been an active and sympathetic worker for morals and religion. As a man of faith and high opinion, he sees the world advancing to higher conceptions of truth and better moral conditions. The new output of faith and expectation for a better world after the war is but the harvest which has been prepared by good men and women working through the centuries.

# League of Free Nations Association

A group of about fifty American publicists, professors, lawyers, and students of international affairs has formulated the following Statement of Principles in behalf of a new world economic order to secure peace with justice. The appeal to stand behind the principles enunciated by President Wilson against reactionary forces attracts wide attention.

**T**HE object of this Society is to promote a more general realization and support by the public of the conditions indispensable to the success, at the Peace Conference and thereafter, of American aims and policy as outlined by President Wilson, particularly in his speeches of January 8 and September 27, 1918.

The particular aims, such as the liberation of Belgium, Serbia, Poland and Bohemia, and their future protection from aggression, and America's own future security on land and sea, are dependent upon the realization of the more general aim of a sounder future international order, the corner-stone of which must be a League of Nations as defined by President Wilson.

The purposes of such a League are to achieve for all peoples, great and small:

- (1) Security: the due protection of national existence.
- (2) Equality of economic opportunity.

Both these purposes demand for their accomplishment profound changes in the spirit and principles of the older international statecraft. The underlying assumption heretofore has been that a nation's security and prosperity rest chiefly upon its own strength and resources. Such an assumption has been used to jus-

tify statesmen in attempting, on the ground of the supreme need for national security, to increase their own nation's power and resources by insistence upon strategic frontiers, territory with raw material, outlets to the sea, even though that course does violence to the security and prosperity of others. Under any system in which adequate defence rests upon individual preponderance of power, the security of one must involve the insecurity of another, and must inevitably give rise to covert or overt competitions for power and territory dangerous to peace and destructive to justice.

Under such a system of competitive as opposed to cooperative nationalism the smaller nationalities can never be really secure. Obviously Belgians, Jugoslavs, Poles, Czechoslovaks will not be secure if they have to depend upon their own individual, unaided strength. International commitments of some kind there must be. The price of secure nationality is some degree of internationalism.

The fundamental principle underlying the League of Nations is that the security and rights of each member shall rest upon the strength of the whole League, pledged to uphold by their combined power international arrangements ensuring fair treatment for all.



The first concern of a League of Nations is to find out what those arrangements should be, what rules of international life will ensure justice to all, how far the old international law or practice must be modified to secure that end. It is to the interest of the entire world that every nation should attain its maximum economic development, provided it does not prevent a similar development of other nations. The realization of this aim depends upon a gradually increasing freedom of mutual exchange with its resulting economic interdependence. It is certain, for instance, that if anything approaching equality of economic opportunity as between great and small, powerful and weak, is to be obtained, the following must be guaranteed for all on equal terms:

(a) No state shall accord to one neighbor privileges not accorded to others—this principle to apply to the purchase of raw material as well as to access to markets. Equality of economic opportunity does not mean the abolition of all tariffs or the abolition of the right of self-governing states to determine whether Free Trade or Protection is to their best interests.

(b) States exercising authority in non-self-governing territories shall not exercise that power as a means of securing a privileged economic position for their own nationals; economic opportunity in such territories shall be open to all people on equal terms, the peoples of nations possessing no such territories being in the same position economically as those

that possess great subject empires. Investments and concessions in backward countries should be placed under international control.

(c) Goods and persons of the citizens of all states should be transported on equal terms on international rivers, canals, straits, or railroads.

(d) Landlocked states must be guaranteed access to the sea on equal terms both by equality of treatment on communications running through other states, and by the use of seaports.

The first task is legislative in its nature. The problem is to modify the conditions that lead to war. It will be quite inadequate to establish courts of arbitration or of law if they have to arbitrate or judge on the basis of the old laws and practices. These have proved insufficient.

It is obvious that any plan ensuring national security and equality of economic opportunity will involve a limitation of national sovereignty. It is here particularly that the success of the League will demand the doing of the "unprecedented things" mentioned by President Wilson. States possessing ports that are the natural outlet of a hinterland occupied by another people will perhaps regard it as an intolerable invasion of their independence if their sovereignty over those ports is not absolute but limited by the obligation to permit of their use by a foreign and possibly rival people on equal terms. States possessing territories in Africa or Asia inhabited by populations in a backward state of de-

velopment, have generally heretofore looked for privileged and preferential treatment of their own industry and commerce in those territories. Great interests will be challenged, some sacrifice of national pride demanded, and the hostility of political factions in some countries will be aroused.

Yet if, after the war, states are to be shut out from the sea; if rapidly-expanding populations find themselves excluded from raw materials indispensable to their prosperity; if the privileges and preferences enjoyed by states with overseas territories place the less powerful states at a disadvantage, we shall have re-established potent motives for that competition for political power which, in the past, has been so large an element in the causation of war and the subjugation of weaker peoples. The ideal of the security of all nations and "equality of opportunity" will have failed of realization.

Both President Wilson and Lord Grey have insisted that the creation of a League of Nations must be an integral part of the settlement itself. Both have indeed declared that if it is not established at that settlement, it is never likely to be.

The reason is obvious. If the League is not a political reality at the time that the territorial readjustments come to be discussed; if, as in the past, nations must look for their future security chiefly to their own strength and resources, then inevitably, in the name of the needs of national defence, there will be claims for strategic frontiers and terri-

tories with raw material which do violence to the principle of nationality. Afterwards those who suffer from such violations would be opposed to the League of Nations because it would consecrate the injustice of which they would be the victims. A refusal to trust to the League of Nations, and a demand for "*material*" guarantees for future safety, will set up that very ferment which will afterwards be appealed to as proof that the League could not succeed because men did not trust it. A bold "Act of Political Faith" in the League will justify itself by making the League a success; but, equally, lack of faith will justify itself by ruining the League.

Just as the general acceptance of the principles of the League must precede the territorial settlement, so must it precede attempts to reduce armaments. The League should not be, in the first stage, a proposal to relinquish arms, but to combine them; it should be an agreement upon the methods by which they can be used in common for common security. The League of Nations is not an alternative to the use of force, but the organization of force to the end that it may be effective for our common protection.

If nations can be brought to realize that they can in truth look to the League as the main guaranty of political security and economic opportunity, that those things do not demand unwilling provinces as sources of man-power or raw material, nor seaports as a condition of economic development, then one of

the main obstacles to the liberation of subject nationalities will have been removed, and the solution of the specific problems of Poland, Alsace-Lorraine, Bohemia, Yugoslavia and the self-determination of the peoples of Turkey and Russia, will have been enormously facilitated.

The administrative machinery of a workable internationalism already exists in rudimentary form. The international bodies that have already been established by the Allied belligerents—who now number over a score—to deal with their combined military resources, shipping and transport, food, raw materials and finance, have been accorded immense powers. Many of these activities—particularly those relating to the international control of raw material and shipping—will have to be continued during the very considerable period of demobilization and reconstruction which will follow the war. Problems of demobilization and civil reemployment particularly will demand the efficient representation of Labor and Liberal elements of the various states. With international commissions, and exercising the same control over the economic resources of the world, an international government with powerful sanction will in fact exist.

The international machinery will need democratization as well as progressive differentiation of function. If the League of Nations is not to develop into an immense bureaucratic union of governments instead of a democratic union of peoples, the elements of (a) complete publicity and

(b) effective popular representation must be insisted upon. The first of these is implicit in the principle, so emphasized by President Wilson, that in the future there must be an end to secret diplomacy. The second can only be met by some representation of the peoples in a body with legislative powers over international affairs—which must include minority elements—as distinct from the governments of the constituent states of the League. It is the principle which has found expression in the American Union as contrasted with the Federated States of the German Empire. If the Government of the United States consisted merely of the representatives of forty-eight states, the Union could never have been maintained on a democratic basis. Happily it consists also of the representatives of a hundred million people. The new international government must make the same provision and deliberately aim to see that all the great parties and groups in the various states obtain representation.

The assurance of the political, civil, religious and cultural rights of minorities within states is an even more difficult problem. But genuinely democratic parliamentary institutions in the League, ensuring some expression of minority opinion as well as complete publicity, will be a strong deterrent if not a complete assurance against tyrannical treatment of minorities within its constituent states.

Indispensable to the success of

American policy are at least the following:

*A universal association of nations based upon the principle that the security of each shall rest upon the strength of the whole, pledged to uphold international arrangements giving equality of political right and economic opportunity, the association to be based upon a constitution democratic in character, possessing a central council or parliament as truly representative as possible of all the political parties in the constituent nations, open to any nation, and only such nation, whose government is responsible to the people. The formation of such an association should be an integral part of the settlement itself and its territorial problems, and not distinct therefrom. It should prohibit the formation of minor leagues or special covenants, or special economic combinations, boycotts or exclusions. Differences between members should be submitted to its judicial bodies. Its administrative machinery should be built up from the inter-allied bodies already in existence, expanded into international bodies differentiated in function and democratized in constitution. The effective sanction of the association should not be alone the combined military power of the whole used as an instrument of repression, but such use of the world-wide control of economic resources as would make it more advantageous for a state to become and remain a member of the association and to cooperate with it, than to challenge it.*

All the principles above outlined

are merely an extension of the principles that have been woven into the fabric of our own national life.

In search of freedom, our forefathers turned their faces to the West, set out across the Atlantic, and laid the foundations of an American commonwealth. Even in the free spaces of the New World they could not attain independence, unity, and democracy, in such measure as we now possess them, without struggle. It has remained for our generation, with these things not wholly achieved, to turn our faces toward the East and set out overseas across the Atlantic to aid the people from whom we sprang to achieve those things in the midst of the more rigid social fabric of the Old World, and against the forces of despotism, autocracy, imperialism, privilege and militarism, which found their supreme embodiment in the Prussian scheme of world-dominion.

In war and in settlement we stand for the principles which have shot through each of the great epochs of American struggle. In our War of the Revolution, in which we ourselves struck for independence and nationality, we established tradition which prompts us to stand for the freedom and self-determination of the weaker peoples; for restoration and reparation for Belgium and Serbia; a united and independent Poland; justice to the peoples of Alsace-Lorraine; recognition of the Czechoslovaks and the Jugoslavs; the freedom of the Russian Revolution to achieve its own destiny. And in our championship, through the Monroe

Doctrine, of the lesser American states, we supported this fundamental principle in one hemisphere which we now urge as a basis for both.

In our Civil War, in which we determined whether in the New World a nation conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, might endure, we liberated a race which we had oppressed, and made the union of free states secure. So now we stand for the greatest measure of autonomy, and for absolute freedom of religion, of civil liberty, of cultural development of the weaker people within the stronger nations, and for the native people of the undeveloped regions of the earth.

And out of our civil travail through which was confirmed our union of free states, which with unfortified boundaries and unantagonistic development stretches from ocean to ocean, we stand for the development of a League of Nations which shall bring the free peoples of the earth into a new fellowship, which shall settle their disputes by conciliation and adjudication, which shall put the economic power and the armed force of the whole against the violators of justice and the disturbers of peace, and which shall be open to all nations who subscribe to its principles and by a full democratic scheme of government make themselves eligible to such an alliance of free peoples.

So it is that President Wilson was

in line with the great currents of American tradition when he characterized this as a war "to make the world safe for democracy."

In our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Emancipation Proclamation, the New World has offered documents which have contributed to the organized freedom of mankind, and in President Wilson's state papers we have the elements of a new charter. At a time when deep-seated forces of reaction would hamper the President in his democratic course and assert the old schemes of competitive militarism, of economic wars after war, of division and bitterness and unhealed sores, such as will breed further wars and rob this one of its great culmination, we call on all liberal-minded men to stand behind the principles which the President has enunciated, and we invite them to join in fellowship with us for their realization.

About one hundred names were signed to early publications of this statement of principles offered for general consideration. Comment is desired. The officers of the League of Free Nations Association, 130 W. 42nd Street, New York, are: Norman Hapgood, president; Lincoln Colcord, secretary; Wendell T. Bush, treasurer; Christina Merri-man, executive secretary. Executive Committee—Richard S. Childs, chairman; Allen T. Burns, Stephen P. Duggan, Norman Hapgood, Learned Hand, Frederick C. Howe, Paul U. Kellogg, J. G. McDonald, William L. Ransom, Ralph S. Rounds, Mary K. Simkhovitch, Charlotte H. Sorchan, Dorothy Whitney Straight, Robert H. Gardiner, John F. Moors.



# International Control of Trade Routes

By CALVIN TOMKINS

*Ex-Commissioner of Docks and Ferries, New York City*

THE desire to achieve commercial privilege or freedom from commercial restraint, and the virtual shrinkage of the world as a consequence of improved transportation were the primary causes of the great war. These causes made it difficult for nations to live together unless they did so in a cooperative way, and this Germany would not do. National sovereignty and international anarchy had become interchangeable terms.

The nations of the world have come to occupy the same relation to each other as that which exists between the citizens within each state. When a national oversteps the law he is shut up in prison. When a nation in future oversteps international law or comity the remedy will be to shut that nation up, *i. e.*, to close the seas and land routes to it. That is what was done to Germany, and Germany lost the war because she was shut out from the rest of the world. The sea power of England and the United States opened the world's resources to the Allies and kept them closed to Germany.

Railroads and terminals within the United States have been co-ordinated and administered as a great national business unit, with an efficiency never before attained. The war, aside from its political ends, effected a stupendous change for the better in our heretofore disorganized transport

systems. We threw to the winds antiquated attempts to keep railroad competition alive, and substituted co-operation. The best thing the Government did for the roads was to unite them instead of keeping them apart and leaving each road to meet its peak loads with its limited resources. This integration of systems and service will not be pulled apart after the war.

International supervision of the mercantile marine of the world took place under the stress of the war. The Allies pooled their ships and port facilities, and circumstances compelled the neutral nations to co-operate with them against Germany, since there was no German commerce. The question now arises how far such international protection or control of ocean transportation will go, and how permanent it will become. When we recall to what an unwarranted extent irresponsible private shipping pools have in former years either fixed or influenced the value of our exports and imports, we are prompted to ask whether the war-time policy should not be perpetuated. In view of the immense investment which the United States has in ships, and the legal status it has accorded its seamen, is it not desirable that some policy of international control over ocean commerce should be substituted for the chaotic, wasteful competition which has heretofore pre-

ailed?—a competition which, among all the competitions in the world, has been perhaps the most bitter and the most provocative of international differences.

The freedom of private trade between citizens who can not wage war should be protected against the attempts which will everywhere be made to nationalize trade and arouse international jealousies.

Cooperation, engendered by the war, should be expanded throughout the world, with the intention of making it universal and permanent. That is the practical way to direct international cooperation toward trade freedom which is a state of peace. It is not the formal evidence of international organization, but continuous adaptation of existing conditions to permanent peace—needs that is important. It will not be possible to feed starving Europe except through such international integration of transportation, and this should be the first practical step toward International Federalism—the alternative is famine and anarchy.

To protect their privileges, private interests have heretofore advanced the theory of the economic rivalry of states. They have sought to enlist a chauvinistic enthusiasm, based upon false inferences, to strengthen the mediæval theory of exclusive trade relations, which was only slowly yielding to economic forces. At their instigation each state attempted to secure exclusive privileges for its citizens and inhibitions for others, instead of insisting upon world-wide equality of opportunity—the open door.

There are different kinds and degrees of national restrictions upon trade.

First—There is the restriction of tariffs imposed by nations upon themselves (protectionism). Under existing circumstances, it must be left to the intelligent self-interest of the masses and the solvent influences of commerce to overcome gradually the delusions and the selfish private interests on which this obstruction partly rests.

Second—There are restrictions upon opportunities to trade with territories ruled as colonies, or being exploited within spheres of influence. This is what now remains of the old mercantile system which flourished before our Revolutionary War and which has been weakening ever since. The fear of such restrictions being applied against states and their consequent inability to obtain raw materials, furnish today the main motive for a policy of colonial oversea possessions. If industrial states could be assured of the application of the open-door policy, no state would envy another its colonies. Colonies should be the world's commons.

Third—International Commerce has met with restrictions placed upon the use of the terminal and land-transfer facilities of the great trade routes and seaports of the world. A few such ports command entrance to and exit from vast continental hinterlands. It is vital to these interior regions that their natural communications with the outside world should be kept widely open,

and this is equally important to the rest of the world. Obstructive control of such ports and routes to the detriment of the world's commerce cannot, and will not, be tolerated by states whose interests would be adversely affected. No state strong enough to assert itself will acquiesce in the exclusion, permanent or temporary, of its trade from the equal use of the natural avenues and facilities of commerce. Whoever obstructs communications creates a widely ramifying injustice and incentive to disorder.

In this connection Rotterdam and Antwerp are the North Sea ports which naturally serve the trade of Central Europe, including that of Eastern France, Germany, Austria, Switzerland and Russia. Their neutral service, or at least that of the best equipped free port districts within them, as well as the use of bonded railroads between them and interior countries, should be guaranteed. Similar freedom for international exchange should be guaranteed at Adriatic, Aegean and Chinese ports. Constantinople and the overland route through it to the Orient should be internationalized. The lower Danube should be returned to International Control, and the navigation of the Rhine from Switzerland to the North Sea should be assured to all the Central European countries. The free navigation of the great rivers of Africa and Asia should be confirmed.

Fourth—The Freedom of the Seas—If we are to have any formal recognition of International Co-

operation, the civilized world must agree on the "absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants." The war has conclusively demonstrated that international control of the sea is the only practical physical way to limit lawless nationalism on land.

Panama, Suez, the Mediterranean, Gibraltar, the Dardanelles, the Kiel, the Sault, the Belt, the Baltic and the English Channel, and less important straits, are the world's international highways through which commercial passage should be maintained on equal terms for all ships. The Panama Canal ports, affected as they are with an international use, should be the first American ports adapted to this advance toward a cooperative policy. Through the influence of President Wilson, the Panama Canal itself is now operated under conditions of equality for all.

With freer commercial intercourse, the greater becomes the community of interests and the mutual interdependence of nations and the less important become their rivalries. Coincidentally, international policies will be progressively subordinated to just commercial needs. Peace must be founded on justice, and fundamental justice is justice in economic relations. The leading nations of the world will more and more insist on the right of all, big or little, to peaceful activity and de-

velopment, and must be prepared to act, as a police force, to restrain either war, local jealousy, lack of enterprise, or stupidity. Hereafter the criterion will not be what belligerents may want, but what the peace-wishing world will tolerate from them.

Progress toward permanent peace can be accelerated by international guarantees of free access to the sea and of the free use of it. The establishment of a maritime concordat, naval and commercial, between Great Britain and the United States is the first step needed to realize this end.

## Equality on International Trade Routes

By J. P. CHAMBERLAIN

*Head of Legislative Reference Bureau, Columbia University*

A JUST settlement of the issues involved in this war must insure to all friendly nations, so far as agreements can do it, an equality in economic opportunity, of which an essential part is equality in the use of the great trade routes both by land and sea.

President Wilson, January 22, 1917, declared that "every great people now struggling toward a full development of its resources and of its powers should be assured a direct outlet to the great highways of the sea."

To that end he suggested the "neutralization of direct rights of way" under international guarantees.

In the program laid down in his address one year later, January 8, 1918, he demands "an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance."

Our President has pointed out, more clearly than any other leader, that land commerce and sea commerce will alike need the protection of international supervision and con-

trol, if the promise of a final permanent peace is to be assured.

Therefore we believe that public opinion should begin to consider what must be the foundations of economic justice among friendly nations with reference to their common right of access to any of the great arteries of traffic, whatever may be the method of transportation.

It is evident that the commercial facilities of trans-continental railways and of some inland waterways may be as rightly regarded as international common carriers as are those that employ the highways of the oceans. International agreements should, therefore, insure fair treatment for all nations in the use of such common carriers, and especially must the people of small or land-locked nations be assured, for themselves and their goods, an uninterrupted transit to the sea.

There are many precedents for action in favor of freedom of commerce and equality of treatment in transportation. (The United States at Panama; the Powers of Europe at the Suez, have agreed to maintain the principles of liberty and equality



in the great inter-oceanic canals.) A hundred years ago, at the Peace of Paris in 1814, "in order that the peoples may become less strange one to another," the Powers agreed that navigation on international rivers should be free, and if, at the Congress of Vienna, and in many subsequent treaties, the full measure of liberty proclaimed at Paris has been limited, the benefits of this frank declaration of principle are apparent in all the fluvial conventions since made, culminating in the full and complete liberty of navigation and commerce accorded to all nations on the La Plata in 1853, on the lower Danube in 1856, and on the Niger and Congo in 1885.

Precedents for an international authority to assure equality of treatment already exist in the International Joint Commission which by the Treaty of 1909 regulates the use of our northern boundary waterways in the name of the United States and Canada; in the International Commission which for more than half a century down to the outbreak of this war exercised varying grades of authority on the Danube river (1856), in the similar arrangements regulating commerce on other European rivers, such as the Rhine and Scheldt and their tributaries (1815), and the Pruth (1866); in the international arrangements that provide a government for the city of Tangier; and in the operation of more than fifty public international associations.

— We ask for consideration of the possibility of extending this principle of International direction of

traffic to transcontinental railways that are essential to the industrial and commercial life of several nations. If not the right to, at least the mutual advantage of, equality in railroad transportation is recognized by the International Railway Convention of 1890, through which eleven European States have bound themselves reciprocally to carry, on equal terms, in interstate commerce, the goods of their respective citizens. Many treaties and conventions between separate States testify to a common interest in securing railway transportation, notably in the case of the St. Gotthard Railroad, built by a Swiss Company in Switzerland, but aided by subventions of Germany and Italy as well as of Switzerland. North and South American countries by their encouragement of the Pan-American Railway, have recognized the importance of international railroads to a community of nations. International supervision of international railway traffic might be developed out of the already existing functions of the International Railway Freight Association, strengthened by a provision for arbitration similar to that inserted in the most recent St. Gotthard Treaty (1909), so that every question of discrimination would be examined by a technical board and then, if necessary, brought before an international tribunal. The question of the need for and the form of an International guarantee must depend on the circumstances of each case and must be adjusted to existing political and geographical conditions. A fruitful source of dis-



sension and danger would be removed by assuring equality on all transportation systems in the dependent countries of Asia and Africa. These systems are developed by foreign capital and enterprise and are usually controlled and managed by powerful foreign financial groups. They are, therefore, international in their ownership and operation, their business is largely of foreign origin, interference with them causes an international not a local question to arise, so that international supervision over them is justified. Where such lines of communication are operated by existing corporations, whether native or foreign, the League of Nations, if organized, should be given a minority representation on their Boards of Directors to assure against breach of the international statute, requiring equal and fair treatment.

Precedent is not lacking for such an arrangement. In the Abyssinian agreement of 1909, France agreed that English and Italian subjects should have equal treatment on a private French railway running from a French port into Abyssinia; and to guarantee performance of her obligations, consented that an English, an Italian and an Abyssinian representative should have seats in the railway board. These directors may be said to represent all nations, since the treaty required equality of treatment to all persons on the road. It is said that England finally agreed to allow the construction of the Bagdad railroad to the port of Bassorah, on the condition that England should have two directors

on the board to protect the equality of treatment assured to all by the charter of the Turkish corporation controlled by Germans, which was to construct and operate the road.

By this representation regulations may be corrected before they are issued, or withdrawn if their operation appears unjust; rates may be discussed from an international standpoint and given full publicity before going into effect or changed by action of the board after publication; protests by individual shippers may be assured of a sympathetic hearing, and so the ponderous and dangerous machinery of state intervention may be conjured away. The few questions which would nevertheless be brought up by the different States could then be left to arbitral courts.

Such international supervision and control would take cognizance of the following public interests, as well as those already mentioned:

1. The Eurasian railway lines that traverse the Balkan peninsula and Asia Minor.
2. The intercolonial railways and waterways of Africa.
3. The neutralization of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles and their shores, including the city of Constantinople.
4. The preservation and development of China and Persia, especially of their finances, their rail and waterways and their ports, which are, or will become, the outlets for so much of Asia.
5. The recognition, under international guarantees, as free ports, with equal commercial rights for the interested nations or their inhabitants, such as:
  - Braila*—for the Danube States;
  - Saloniki*—for all Balkan States;
  - Fiume and Trieste*—for Austria-Hungary, Germany and Italy;
  - Danzig*—for Poland and Germany;
  - Riga*—for all eastern Baltic States and Russia;
  - Antwerp, Rotterdam and Amsterdam*—for Central Europe;
  - Possibly *Alexandretta, Basra and Batum*—for Asia Minor, in addition to *Constantinople, Odessa* for the Black Sea, *Genoa* for Germany and Switzerland.

# The Rise of Czecho-Slovak Independence

By J. F. SMETANKA

*Director, Washington Office, Czecho-Slovak National Council*

IN the first Czech newspapers received in this country that describe the bloodless revolution by which Bohemia became free, one comes across an interesting incident. It appears that as soon as Austrian rule was overthrown, a bookseller in Prague dug out from some hidden place a portrait of Thomas G. Masaryk and displayed it in his windows; every one passing by took his hat off to the man who is almost worshipped by his people, because through his efforts a subject nation in the very center of German *Mittel-Europa* was formally lined up on the side of the Allies and accepted by the big Western Powers as their partner.

At the time the American Government, following the example of France, Italy and England, extended its recognition to the Czecho-Slovak National Council and Masaryk, its president, the Czecho-Slovak lands were still under the Austrian rule as fully as at any time during the last three hundred years. Masaryk's government did not control one inch of soil over which it claimed rightful rule; the black and yellow flag of Austria waved over Prague. To recognize such a newly created revolutionary government was without precedent. However, the Czecho-Slovaks could point to something more important than the

control of a portion of their territory: they could point to three armies fighting on three different battlefronts, a division in France, two divisions in Italy and 100,000 men in Russia and Siberia. They could point to the unanimous sentiment of the Czecho-Slovak people, expressed in terms that could not be misunderstood, and endorsed without a single exception by every elected representative of the people.

The body recognized by the Allies as a belligerent government grew up around the person of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the grand old man of Bohemia. Masaryk had been the one man in Bohemia who saw the war coming and who knew what to do when it broke out. Before the frontier restrictions on the departure of political suspects were tightened, Masaryk escaped from Austria to organize a revolutionary movement against the empire which, as he expressed it, consisted only of the dynasty, bureaucracy and aristocracy and the few higher military officers. Before he left, he held a consultation with all the political leaders of the Czech people and received authority to speak on behalf of all political parties with the exception of the Clerical.

Masaryk had a tremendous task ahead of him: to convince the statesmen of the Allied Powers that Aus-

tria deserved to be broken up into its component parts and that the nations, Slav and Latin, which had been oppressed in Austria by the Germans and Magyars, should be liberated. Austria had been on the map of Europe for so many centuries that the statesmen and publicists could not imagine a Europe without the Hapsburg Empire in the very center. Nor was there the same hatred against Austria as there was against Germany. If a feasible plan, one well founded on justice and expediency, could have been suggested for the disruption of Germany, it would have been welcomed with open arms by the statesmen of Paris and London. But Austria was looked upon as a smaller erring brother who was led into mischief by her German partner; and there were elements everywhere, especially in the aristocratic and Catholic circles, that worked hard for the preservation of the Hapsburg empire. Masaryk was practically alone in his fight against the oldest European dynasty and an empire of 50 million people. His only allies were his countrymen, scattered in small numbers throughout the Allied and neutral countries, and living in somewhat larger numbers in the United States. These became organized everywhere under the inspiration of his leadership into local bodies of which by far the strongest was the Bohemian National Alliance of America with headquarters in Chicago, and the Slovak League of America with headquarters in Pittsburgh. But Czechs as far away as the Argentine and the South African Republic sent Masa-

ryk money with which to conduct his campaign for Czecho-Slovak independence.

Out of the representatives of the scattered Czecho-Slovak colonies a body was formed called the Czecho-Slovak National Council with headquarters in Paris. The actual direction of affairs was in the hands of Masaryk whose age, experience, past accomplishments and the unique respect in which his name was held by all Czecho-Slovaks made him the actual dictator of the rebellion. Two other officers of the Council constituted, together with Masaryk, the revolutionary Czecho-Slovak Government. General Milan R. Štefánik, who lived in Paris at the outbreak of the war and was promoted for gallantry as an aviator to the rank of brigadier-general in the French Army, was the vice-president of the Council, and most successful diplomat. Dr. Edouard Benes, formerly instructor in the University of Prague, was the General Secretary at the Paris offices and has had much to do with securing the recognition of the French and Italian governments for the Council.

The situation in Bohemia is less well known than the progress of the campaign that has gone on in the Allied lands. For nearly three years after war broke out Bohemia lay silent with the silence of the grave. Police rule was supreme in the Czecho-Slovak lands all through the reign of Francis Joseph I. and down to the outbreak of the Russian revolution. The Austrian parliament was adjourned in the Spring of 1914 and did not meet again until May,

1917. The Diet of Bohemia, the only legislative body where the Czechs were in a majority, was illegally dissolved in 1913. So there was no parliamentary tribunal in session in which the elected representatives of the Czech people could voice their sentiments. They could not even do so in the newspapers, for the Austrian censorship during the first three years of the war exceeded in severity all that has ever been known in any other country. Fully two-thirds of the Czech newspapers were suppressed before the first year of the war ran out; the editors of nearly all the papers were warned that any "disloyal" writing would have as a consequence their immediate drafting for military service. The military correspondence bureau furnished all the news of the war for the Czech papers, and even went so far as to furnish them editorial articles which had to be printed so as to create the impression that they were the free expression of opinion by the editors themselves. The principal political leaders of the people were all placed in jail, and thousands of less important men and women were sentenced to death and actually executed.

In spite of all this terrorism the Austrian government was unable to secure a single expression of loyalty from any Czech political party, from any of the deputies or from any of the cities of Bohemia and Moravia. And while perfect peace, imposed by the executioner, reigned in Bohemia, the Czecho-Slovak soldiers in the Austrian Army went over to the Russians in regiments and battalions

and laid the foundation for the Czecho-Slovak Army which in a most romantic way wrested the control of Russia and Siberia from the Germans.

In the spring of 1917 the effects of the Russian revolution began to manifest themselves in Austria. The young Emperor was far from certain that the German side would win; he disliked to be under the thumb of the domineering German Kaiser and he feared the outbreak of rebellion in his own states. The police rule was relaxed, the censor lifted his heavy hand from the Czech publications, amnesty was given to the Czech leaders who had been sentenced to death upon a charge of high treason, and the Austrian parliament was called to meet in Vienna at the end of May, 1917. Since that time we can trace the evolution of the revolutionary movement in Bohemia which, while outwardly not connected with the movement headed by Masaryk abroad, was nevertheless in close touch with him and ran along parallel lines.

The opening gun was fired by an appeal issued shortly before the convocation of the Reichsrat and signed by 183 Czech authors. The appeal called upon the deputies to be brave and not to make the slightest concession from the national program. The deputies were equal to the expectations of their people. Before the war they were split into half a dozen political parties, but now they acted as one body, the Czech Parliamentary Club, and on the first day of the session they read to the ministers and to the deputies of all the Aus-



trian races a declaration in which they demanded the union of all branches of the Czecho-Slovak people into one democratic Czecho-Slovak State. This was a very radical pronouncement, especially in its emphasis that the Slovaks of Hungary, a branch of the Czecho-Slovak people, should form a part of the Czecho-Slovak State. For by that demand they attacked the existing structure of the Hapsburg monarchy, namely, the Dual system, under which the Czechs were ruled by Germans in Austria and the Slovaks oppressed by the Magyars in Hungary. But even so their radical program, as worded in the declaration of May 30th, might still conceivably be realized within the frame of the Austro-Hungarian Empire; a federalized Austria might be constructed of which the democratic Czecho-Slovak State would be a part. The fact is that the declaration of May 30th was purposely worded so as to be open to a double interpretation, for at that time a minority of the Czech deputies still hesitated to declare open war on the Hapsburgs.

From that time on until the end of 1917 the cabinet of Clam-Martinic, and later the cabinet of Seydler, offered various concessions to the Czechs in order to break down their rebellious conduct or at least to create a division among them. So a number of seats in the ministry were tendered to the Czech deputies, and when they were refused, a proposal was brought forward by the government to create a parliamentary commission for the revision of the constitution; but the Czechs refused to

take part in the deliberations of the commission. Emperor Charles thought that by granting amnesty to the condemned leaders of Bohemia he would win their good will; but the men released looked upon it not as an act of grace, but as a tardy concession wrung from the Emperor by necessity. The Emperor went so far as to dangle before the eyes of the Czechs the possibility that he would let himself be crowned king of Bohemia in Prague and confirm at the coronation the ancient liberties of the kingdom. All in vain. Revolutionary feelings in the Bohemian lands grew in intensity, as news came from Russia of the victorious attack by the first Czecho-Slovak brigade on the Austrian Army at Zborov in July, 1917, and as the Allies, and in particular France, encouraged the Czecho-Slovaks in the belief that the Entente would support at the peace conference the demand for Bohemia's independence.

The second stage of the revolt of the Czecho-Slovaks in their homelands against their Austrian rulers was reached at the so-called Constituent Assembly at Prague. On January 6, 1918, over two hundred representatives of the Czechs met in Prague; there were present all the Czech deputies elected by universal manhood suffrage to the Vienna parliament, and all the surviving members of the last-elected Diets of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia. So the Assembly rightfully claimed the full right to speak for the Czech people; the Slovaks alone were not officially represented owing to the Magyar tyranny, but they manifested their



approval of the Assembly afterwards. In the declaration issued by the Assembly there cannot be found, as Premier Seydler states, "the slightest trace of any connection with the Austrian Empire"; it states that the Czech nation reclaims its independence, its own sovereignty and its own democratic state. Consistently with this statement of their principles and aims the Czech deputies in the Vienna Parliament fought all along against the government and especially against the granting of credits necessary to carry on the war. The Austrian government on the other hand gave up all hope of conciliating the Czechs and put in force once more a modified police rule in Bohemia and put into effect illegally some of the extreme demands which had been urged for years by the German minority of Bohemia. The Czechs met this with the fiercest kind of defiance. A sample of the boldness with which they spoke in parliament is found in a fierce invective pronounced by Deputy Stránský: "We declare that we will hate Austria with its German backbone forever, and with God's help we hope some day to smash it. Austria embodies century old crimes against the liberty of mankind. The highest national duty of the Czech people is to harm Austria wherever and whenever it is possible. Austria is a state without patriots and without patriotism; it is an absurdity, it is such a state that Czech soldiers, sent against the enemy, embrace him and join him to form regiments and divisions against Austria."

The third and last stage in the fight

for Czecho-Slovak independence occurred in October, 1918. The feeble attempt of Seydler's ministry to employ force against the traitorous Czechs did not accomplish much. The once formidable state machine directed by emperor's men in Vienna was sadly run down. The ministers commanded, but the bureaucratic apparatus would not respond. In Bohemia even the district captains, the most formidable local representatives of the Central government, even the Austrian gendarmes, feared more the wrath of the Czech people than the censure of their superiors in Vienna. Deserters from the army in ever-increasing numbers returned to their homes and showed themselves openly without being arrested. In Prague a body was organized which assumed to speak in the name of the Czecho-Slovak people and claimed and received complete obedience all over the country. This body was called the Czecho-Slovak National Committee and was composed of the leading Czech deputies, the big men of the nation, whether in the field of literature, art, business or the learned professions; the Slovaks of Hungary were represented on this central committee.

At the head of this was Dr. Karel Kramár who had been sentenced to death for high treason during the reign of Francis Joseph and was pardoned from political motives by Charles. Everyone both in Prague and Vienna knew quite well that this committee had been created for the purpose of assuming charge of the situation, when signal should be given to rise in rebellion. Under-

ground connection had been maintained all along between the leaders in Prague and the leaders in Paris.

The end of the long struggle came on October 28, 1918. Austria gave in unconditionally to Wilson's demand that the peoples of the monarchy shall settle their destinies for themselves. Andrassy's note signifying the Austrian surrender was the signal for the bloodless revolution of Prague. In a few hours the whole city, the Austrian officials, the local garrison, everybody swore obedience to the Czecho-Slovak National Council. The long slavery lasting three centuries was over without the loss of a single life; in fact not a drop of blood was shed, and as the papers reported the only act of violence consisted in knocking down an Austrian officer who would not take off his imperial insignia. Within twenty-four hours the authority of the National Council was recognized all over Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia; even districts with a German majority submitted to it more or less gracefully. It took a little longer, after some armed skirmishing, before Slovakia was occupied against the opposition of the Magyars. But to-day the Prague government of the new Czecho-Slovak Republic holds sway over the entire territory claimed by it.

Even before the overturn occurred in Prague, a delegation of the Prague National Committee with Kramár at its head met at Geneva Dr. Benes, foreign minister of the recognized Czecho-Slovak government, and in a conference lasting four days reached a complete agree-

ment. As a result of it, on November 14th the newly convoked National Assembly of the Czecho-Slovaks elected Thomas G. Masaryk president of the Czecho-Slovak Republic, and sent an invitation to him to return to Prague promptly. In his absence a ministry was selected composed of representatives of all the political parties in proportion to their strength before the war; Dr. Kramár was made premier.

The new republic does not as yet possess a constitution. It will be one of Masaryk's first acts to issue a call for elections to the Constituent Assembly. But certain features of the new constitution may already be pointed out; they were in fact marked out in the declaration of independence, issued by the provisional government in Paris and Washington on October 18, 1918, and there is no doubt that they will be ratified by the future Constituent Assembly. These principles provide that the Czecho-Slovak state shall be a republic, that the church shall be separated from the state, that the government shall rest on universal suffrage, that women shall have equal rights with men, and that rights of minorities shall be protected.

That the new state will have an orderly government no one can doubt who has followed the behavior of the Czecho-Slovaks in the last four years. At home they stood solidly together against the Austrian government as one man; all parties from the Clerical to the social democrats worked together for the attainment of independence. Abroad their scattered emigrants lined up unanimously back

of Masaryk and organized armies which preserved most wonderful discipline without any compulsion or legally constituted authority. These people know how to cooperate with each other, how to merge their difference in the pursuit of high aims, how to obey their leaders. Among the newly established governments in what used to be the German, Austrian and Russian empires the Czecho-Slovak government is the only one which is based on the will of the people and possesses the unquestioned allegiance of all classes.

The territory claimed for the new state consists of the ancient kingdom of Bohemia with an area of approximately 20,000 square miles, the margravate of Moravia with the Austrian duchy of Silesia, having together an area of slightly over 10,000 square miles, and finally that part of Hungary, bordering on Moravia, which is inhabited by the Slovak race. The boundaries here will have to be drawn along ethnological, rather than historical lines; the

area of Slovak speech in Northern Hungary covers about 24,000 square miles. The new state will have a population numbering twelve millions, of whom two millions will be German and Magyar minorities. The Czechs have on several occasions proclaimed their willingness to give to their German fellow-citizens every desired guarantee against such racial oppression as the Germans have been in the habit of practising on the Czechs.

Independent Bohemia stretches right across the road from Berlin to Vienna and will, together with its kindred states, Poland to the North and Jugoslavia to the South, keep the Germans out of Russia and the East. Of all the Slav nations Bohemia alone will be a country without any illiterates, a country as completely industrialized as any region in Western Europe, a country that is best fitted to serve as the connecting link between the democracies of the West and the new democratic Russia.

---

### THE ILLUSION OF ISOLATION

"It is true, that of all highly-developed nations, America was the least international in her political thinking before the war. She cherished a traditional policy, or, rather, the formula of a traditional policy, bequeathed to her by Washington. The early warning against entangling alliances dominated her thinking long after the facts to which it referred had passed away. The war showed her how illusory was her 'splendid isolation.' For good or for evil, America is a part of the world, and must take a share in its responsibilities.

"The illusion of isolation, however, was never inconveniently entertained by the large commercial forces of this country, which built up an internationalism of their own as their interests dictated. Too often this took a distinctly sinister form. There

was a brotherhood of privileged interests between the United States and Latin-American nations at a time when our jingoism was proclaiming that the American people and the Latins were natural enemies. In a more profitable way the commercial interests have built up a huge structure of international credit which alone makes modern international exchange of goods possible. And this very businesslike and workable structure was built upon what? Upon confidence, faith and mutual respect, those 'ideal' qualities which are needed to make the League of Nations possible. It appears that these qualities, besides being ideal, are very practical and solid, as solid as dollars and cents. If they can be invoked to create a league of business, they can be invoked to create a league of peoples."—*Frank P. Walsh.*

# Luxemburg, the "Alsace-Lorraine" of Belgium

By JAMES GUSTAVUS WHITELEY

*Belgian Consul at Baltimore, Fellow of Royal Historical Society of England, Knight of Order of the Crown of Belgium, Commander of the Order of Leopold II.*

GERMANY is breaking up like a vessel stranded on the rocks.

Provinces and peoples who have been held in subjection for generations by the German autocracy will again be free. Alsace and Lorraine will be restored to France, the Poles will regain their freedom, Sleswig-Holstein will have a chance to choose between Denmark and Prussia. What will be the fate of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg? That little country, lying between Belgium and Germany, was a part of Belgium down to 1839, when it was torn away from the mother land and made a so-called "independent Grand Duchy" for the benefit of Prussia. Luxemburg is to Belgium what Alsace-Lorraine is to France. Will Belgium's lost province be again restored to her? There are many reasons why it should be. The restoration of Luxemburg would strengthen Belgium against future attacks from Germany, but a more important reason for restitution is that in history and in feeling Luxemburg is part of the Belgian nation. The rejoining of Luxemburg to Belgium would not be "annexation" but "re-integration," based on moral and sentimental reasons. Until 1839 the Duchy of Luxemburg and the adjoining Belgian province of Luxemburg (which still remains in the

Kingdom of King Albert) formed one undivided entity. Throughout the history of the Belgian provinces, the Duchy of Luxemburg has led a life similar to that of the County of Flanders, of the County of Hainaut of the Duchy of Brabant, and of the Principality of Liege, which to-day form the Kingdom of Belgium, and which as a composite entity formerly formed the possessions of the Dukes of Burgundy. In 1839 when it was decided to divide Luxemburg and to leave only a portion to the mother country, a storm of protest arose not only from the people of Brussels, but also of Luxemburg.

Among the moral and sentimental reasons for re-integration are the ties which still to-day bind the Belgians to their brothers of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg as much and as strongly as in the period prior to the separation: first, the ties of friendship and of community of spirit and of thought, then the ties of business and of industrial, commercial and financial co-operation, also the ties of blood and affection not only through inter-marriages, which continue in spite of the frontier, but also through the devotion to their Belgian motherland, which so many Luxemburgers have shown in the past four years by giving up their lives in defense of Belgium.



The sentiments of the Luxemburgers were shown in the scenes which took place in 1839 when the great powers found themselves compelled, under the influence of Prussia, to cut off from Belgium the territory which now forms the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg. This separation was made contrary to the wishes of an entire people, who were not consulted in the matter and who immediately raised most violent protests. In Luxemburg as well as in the Belgian Parliament at Brussels there was a united outburst of sorrow and of indignation. All the representatives from Luxemburg protested. They were supported by the entire Belgian Chamber, and petitions and protests flooded the country. The Belgian Ministers of State, with sorrow in their hearts and with indignation in their souls, were compelled to admit that the Government could not hold out against the united efforts of Holland and Prussia. The anguish was heartrending; in vain the Senators and Deputies from Luxemburg registered a most solemn protest at a session of Parliament which was of such tragic intensity that a Flemish Deputy fell dead from emotion.

A year prior to this scene one single representative from Luxemburg, Senator Count de Quarré, had accepted the principle of separation. The indignation among his constituents was such that a popular subscription of two cents each was immediately made among them, with which a medal was struck off; on one side was engraved the words: "The people of Luxemburg to their

Senator, Count de Quarré, 1838"; on the other side was engraved only one stinging word "*Infame*" (scoundrel). Such was the epithet branded by the people of Luxemburg upon the only one of their parliamentary delegates who betrayed his constituents by agreeing to the mutilation of their country; such were their sentiments then; such are their sentiments to-day.

It would occupy too much space—and indeed it would be impossible—to give a complete list of the patriotic people of Luxemburg who, since that period and in spite of the artificial frontier, have devoted their energies and their lives to the service of Belgium. Many of them have been, or are still to-day, Ministers of State, Generals, University Professors, or other high officials under the Belgian Government. Among those who have passed away may be mentioned Jean-Baptiste Nothomb, Jules Le Jeune and Laurent, who were counted among the most distinguished men of Belgium, and besides these there was an innumerable throng of doctors, business men, civil engineers, lawyers, and members of other professions.

It was the same in the army. Major Osterrieth, Chief of the Belgian War Mission to the United States, was interviewed with regard to this question and he confirmed the view that the sentiment of the people of Luxemburg is decidedly in favor of Belgium. The Major spoke particularly about the number of Luxemburgers who have shown their love for Belgium by joining the Belgian



Army. He said, "The men of Luxemburg who had a taste for the profession of arms, went, not to Germany, but to Belgium where they became Belgians and followed the course of studies at the celebrated Military School of Brussels—the same Military School which up to a short time before the war was under the direction of the heroic defender of Liege, General Leman. Not a single year passed when among the young officers graduated from this Academy, there were not at least three or four Luxemburgers. In my own class which graduated from the Military School, there were no less than five Luxemburgers. Considering the population of Luxemburg this is a strikingly large proportion. During the war many Luxemburgers have been among the most heroic officers of the heroic Belgian Army. Among them I will mention Major Bourg, who is known by even the humblest soldier of King Albert and who is beloved by the whole army; also those splendid leaders who have conquered German East Africa for Belgium, such as General Molitor, Colonel Brassel and Major Rouling, the latter of whom received five wounds and lost an eye in a most heroic encounter with the Germans in East Africa.

"Last, but not least, I should mention also General Baltia who was at the beginning of the war a Colonel on the staff of the 1st Division of Cavalry in Belgium and who distinguished himself at the battle of Haelen in August, 1914, where the First Division of Belgian Cavalry,

reinforced by a regiment of infantry, inflicted a severe defeat upon two divisions of the cavalry of the German guard who were supported by a large force of artillery. Colonel Baltia after having commanded a regiment and then afterwards a brigade of infantry on the Yser took command of a division of the Belgian Army which he led to victory during the recent offensive of the Belgian Army in Flanders. I must also mention another one of my comrades who served in our colonial army, Major Thiery, who was also in my class in the Military School, and who rendered brilliant service to civilization as well as to our own country in Africa in the war against the Arab slave traders. I could mention many others, such as General de Keuker, who at one time commanded our Grenadier Regiment; also his son, who was in my regiment; and then, of course, there are many Luxemburgers who are serving in the ranks of the Belgian Army. During the present war more than a thousand men from Luxemburg voluntarily came to join King Albert's army as simple private."

These are not exceptional cases. The inhabitants who remain in the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg are animated by the same sentiments. In spite of the fact that they are temporarily under the heel of the invader and cannot speak freely we constantly hear echoes of their fidelity to the cause of Belgium. Recently it was learned that the foreign family (of German origin) which has been imposed upon the Luxemburg-

ers as their rulers intended to marry one of their princesses to the Crown Prince Ruprecht of Bavaria, and immediately there arose an uproar of popular protest which reached the outside world in spite of the best efforts of the German censor.

There can be no doubt about the sentiment of the people of Luxemburg. Belgians were always warmly welcomed in the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg and, before the war, were able to compete with the German influence in spite of the insidious German infiltration and in spite of the enormous advantage held by the Germans by reason of the fact that the Grand Duchy had been made more or less subservient to Germany by being included in the "Zollverein."

Many industrial concerns in the Grand Duchy were Belgian, and the

industries which had made Luxemburg so rich and which made that territory such a tempting prey to the Germans were, to a large extent, in the hands of the Belgians. This was the case with many of the blast-furnaces. Three of the most important iron-mining companies, Rumelange, Dudelange and Differdange, had been consolidated by Belgian interests into one company known as the Burbach Company.

One can never forget the enthusiastic welcome given to the King and Queen of the Belgians when they visited Luxemburg a few months before the war. The acclamations of the people were such as the little ruler herself, the Grand Duchess Marie Adelaide, had never heard nor could ever hope to hear in her beautiful capital.

---

## The Chile-Peruvian Trouble

By ALEJANDRO ALVAREZ

*Secretary-General American Institute of International Law*

**I**T is apparent that a fictitious agitation over the Chile-Peruvian question has been created by distorting facts, past and present, with the purpose of molding public opinion in this country. But American opinion, always practical and sensible, knows what value to attach to prejudiced and biased reports emanating from interested sources. It knows, above all, that, in the matter of American international affairs especially, it can count on a very wide-awake State Department, supported by a competent Diplomatic

Service. It is safe to say, therefore, that public opinion in this country will not be prone to credit statements or reports originating from other than such official sources. All other sources, particularly those giving rise to sensational reports and articles—the usual fonts of misinformation which the public has learned to doubt—are dangerous and liable to produce temporarily a false impression. We say "temporarily" because when light is shed upon things and impartial witnesses have had opportunity to testify concern-

ing them, truth always speedily regains ascendancy.

The history of the War of the Pacific (1879-1883) is well known and criticism thereof has long ere this exhausted itself. It would be futile, therefore, after a lapse of forty years, to resume a discussion of events in which the American Government took some interest at the time, but in which it never indicated to Chile any objection either as to her manner of conducting that war or negotiating the peace that followed.

That history shows clearly that Chile was the nation that was aggrieved by means of a secret treaty between Bolivia and Peru. In that treaty, also, the Republic of Argentina had been invited to participate since it had been then for some time involved with Chile in an old dispute relating to ill-defined boundaries between nearly all the republics that had emancipated themselves from Spain.

Argentina, however, took no part in the negotiations, preferring to settle its differences alone. Thus the two countries, against which Chile was reluctantly compelled to fight—at a time of financial crisis and economic stagnation in the Republic—stood alone. The allies were conquered in the struggle, and the war was liquidated by three perfect treaties, confirmed by the respective legislatures of the three nations, and never subsequently the subject of protest, to wit: a truce pact signed with Bolivia towards the end of the war and subsequently recast in 1904,

with certain modifications, into a definitive Treaty of Peace, under the domination of which the two countries have since maintained peaceful and cordial relations; and, third, the Treaty of Ancon, of 1883, between Chile and Peru.

This Treaty of Ancon has apparently left pending a question relating to the domination or definitive sovereignty over the provinces of Arica and Tacna, which were to remain for ten years under the sovereignty of Chile, in order that, at the end of that period, a plebiscite might determine that definitive sovereignty. The conditions and form of the plebiscite were to be arranged by a special protocol. This arrangement was never carried out; but the Government of Chile has been at all times ready and willing to fulfill it on the basis of equity and justice in consonance with the will of all the inhabitants involved in the new sovereignty. Furthermore, the Government of Peru recently proposed to the Government of Chile to extend the term for holding of such plebiscite for twenty years more, but Chile could not agree to this.

The foregoing succinct but accurate statement is all that need be said here with respect to past events.

In relation to present events, concerning which so much noise has been made, the deplorable acts that took place during the popular demonstrations in Peru and Chile may be attributed wholly to the impulsive conduct of the Peruvian Consul at Iquique.

The press of Lima for some time

prior to those demonstrations, as it was able to foresee the consequences of the European war, devoted itself to a heated discussion of the War of the Pacific and gave expressions of its expectation of altering the status of things established by the Treaty of Ancon. Those newspapers based their claim for such alteration on an erroneous interpretation of international principles proclaimed in the messages of President Wilson.

The articles that appeared in the Peruvian press, and that abounded in false imputations against Chile, and that bristled with hostilities, were producing a sentiment of irritation on the part of the Chilean people, and, finally, gave rise to an assemblage at Iquique, called for the purpose of protesting against that attitude. Popular demonstrations are not at all times easily controlled by the authorities. The Peruvian Consul lost control of himself and, without communicating his intentions to the local authorities, went on board a vessel lying at anchor in the bay, thus seeking to give himself the appearance of being the victim of popular compulsion.

In vain the Chilean authorities, through the medium of the Vice-Dean of the Consular Corps, offered him complete guaranty of protection, but he insisted in abandoning his post. In the name of the Consular Corps the French Consul, in a communication to the Chilean authorities, acknowledged the correctness of the procedure adopted by those authorities. Had the Peruvian Consul been guided by a different spirit, in the

interest of tranquility in both countries, everything might have ended happily without causing friction between the two peoples and governments, which, as might have been foreseen, must have resulted.

The logical outcome was that the Peruvian people, misled by the distorted accounts of the initial events, resorted to reprisals and assaulted the Chilean Consulates at Paita and Trujillo, thus forcing the consuls to leave the country. The Chilean Government, in order to avoid further difficulties, authorized its Consuls to withdraw if they deemed it prudent. The Peruvian Government adopted a similar course, and, at the same time, protested to the Chilean Government against the occurrences at Iquique. The latter, however, rejected the protest as being founded on an erroneous statement of facts, and assured the Peruvian Government that its Consuls in Chile had been given every possible guaranty by the authorities. This is effectively established by the fact that the Consul General of Peru, on withdrawing from Valparaiso under orders from his Government, publicly stated in an interview that neither he nor his fellow-countrymen had any cause for complaint, they having been always properly treated by the Chilean authorities. A similar statement was given out by the Peruvian Consul at Antofagasta.

The Chilean Government dispatched troops to meet any emergency that might arise in the northern provinces where public opinion was more acutely excited by

these events; throughout the rest of the country perfect tranquility prevailed.

There should be nothing in these events, and in the diverse incidents bearing upon them, that can be viewed as anything but the materialization of a state of mind that can be easily explained and that has its origin in more fundamental causes.

The question of Tacna and Arica is an old one which, from time to time, takes on a form of excitement in Peru—particularly when, as at present, it is involved in the internal politics of the country. At the moment Peru is in the midst of political agitation resulting from the presidential elections. The opposition party is accusing the Government of leniency and of being unable to avail itself of a situation which it believes favorable to a settlement of the question. The Government, on its part, does not admit that it is open to the accusation of being remiss in patriotism, and is, therefore, adopting a policy calculated to satisfy those aspirations.

The fact is that the only party that is interested in bringing about a crisis over this question, and that

is now engaged in creating the impression that the peace of South America is menaced, in order to secure some form of foreign intervention, is the Government of Peru. The occurrences in which the Peruvian Consuls were involved may be considered as the first step in the effort to accomplish those purposes, tending, as they do, to make Chile appear as the disturber of the peace of South America. No interest of Chile would induce her to adopt such a course; indeed, the very contrary is the case. Apply the test of "*cui prodest*" (who benefits) and everything becomes clear.

We may, then, rest assured that the Chilean Government will not permit itself to be ensnared into a policy of violence; neither will it permit itself to be forced into a decision of this, or any other problem, under pressure of disturbing events, much less by threats.

The country is prosperous; it is striving with success to develop resources with her own capital and the invested capital of foreigners who have confidence in her, and her policy is eminently pacific. In spite of everything Chile will maintain herself in tranquility, confident in the right and in her respect for treaties.

---

*From Dr. Roy Malcom, Professor of Political Science, University of Southern California.*—"As a subscriber to THE WORLD COURT MAGAZINE and a teacher of International Polity, I am very desirous, together with many others who are working for a better world order, of seeing a systematic campaign of education in World Court ideas instituted now when the time seems ripe. Count on this institution, and particularly the department which I have the honor to

represent, to aid in every possible way this great work."

---

*From Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York, Director National Conference on Foreign Relations.*—"THE WORLD COURT MAGAZINE has done splendid service in advocating a League of Nations. I sincerely hope it will be able to continue to do so until the plan has been realized."



# President Wilson's Victory Address

On November 11, the day when Germany signed the armistice, President Wilson addressed a joint session of the houses of Congress in these memorable words:

Gentlemen of the Congress:

In these times of rapid and stupendous change it will in some degree lighten my sense of responsibility to perform in person the duty of communicating to you some of the larger circumstances of the situation with which it is necessary to deal.

The German authorities, who have at the invitation of the Supreme War Council been in communication with Marshal Foch, have accepted and signed the terms of armistice which he was authorized and instructed to communicate to them.

*[Here the President read the terms of the armistice.]*

The war thus comes to an end; for having accepted these terms of armistice, it will be impossible for the German command to renew it.

It is not now possible to assess the consequences of this great consummation. We know only that this tragical war, whose consuming flames swept from one nation to another until all the world was on fire, is at an end, and that it was the privilege of our own people to enter it at its most critical juncture in such fashion and in such force as to contribute, in a way of which we are all deeply proud, to the great result.

We know, too, that the object of the war is attained; the object upon which all free men had set their hearts; and attained with a sweeping completeness which even now we do not realize.

Armed imperialism, such as the men conceived who were but yesterday the masters of Germany, is at an end, its illicit ambitions engulfed in black disaster. Who will now seek to revive it? The arbitrary power of the military caste of Germany, which once could secretly and of its own single choice disturb the peace of the world, is discredited and destroyed.

And more than that—much more than that—has been accomplished. The great nations which associated themselves to destroy it have now definitely united in the common purpose to set up such a peace as will satisfy the longing of the whole world for disinterested justice, embodied in settlements which are based upon something much better and more lasting than the selfish competitive interests of powerful states.

There is no longer conjecture as to the objects the victors have in mind. They have a mind in the matter, not only, but a heart also. Their avowed and concerted purpose is to satisfy and protect the weak as well as to accord their just rights to the strong.

The humane temper and intention of the victorious governments has already been manifested in a very practical way. Their representatives in the Supreme War Council at Versailles have by unanimous resolution assured the peoples of the Central Empires that everything that is possible in the circumstances will be

done to supply them with food and relieve the distressing want that is in so many places threatening their very lives; and steps are to be taken immediately to organize these efforts at relief in the same systematic manner that they were organized in the case of Belgium.

By the use of the idle tonnage of the Central Empires it ought presently to be possible to lift the fear of utter misery from their oppressed populations and set their minds and energies free for the great and hazardous tasks of political reconstruction which now face them on every hand. Hunger does not breed reform; it breeds madness and all the ugly distempers that make an ordered life impossible.

For with the fall of the ancient governments which rested like an incubus on the peoples of the Central Empires has come political change not merely, but revolution; and revolution which seems as yet to assume no final and ordered form but to run from one fluid change to another, until thoughtful men are forced to ask themselves with what governments and of what sort are we about to deal in the making of the covenants of peace. With what authority will they meet us, and with what assurance that their authority will abide and sustain securely the international arrangements into which we are about to enter?

There is here matter for no small anxiety and misgiving. When peace is made, upon whose promises and engagements besides our own is it to rest?

Let us be perfectly frank with ourselves and admit that these questions cannot be satisfactorily answered now or at once. But the moral is not that there is little hope of any early answer that will suffice. It is only that we must be patient and helpful and mindful above all of the great hope and confidence that lie at the heart of what is taking place.

Excesses accomplish nothing. Unhappy Russia has furnished abundant recent proof of that. Disorder immediately defeats itself. If excesses should occur, if disorder should for a time raise its head, a sober second thought will follow and a day of constructive action, if we help and do not hinder.

The present and all that it holds belong to the nations and the peoples who preserved their self-control and the orderly processes of their governments; the future to those who prove themselves the true friends of mankind. To conquer with arms is to make only a temporary conquest; to conquer the world by earning its esteem is to make permanent conquest.

I am confident that the nations that have learned the discipline of freedom and that have settled with self-possession to its ordered practice are now about to make conquest of the world by the sheer power of example and of friendly helpfulness.

The peoples who have but just come out from under the yoke of arbitrary government and who are now coming at last into their freedom will never find the treasures of liberty they are in search of if they look for

them by the light of the torch. They will find that every pathway that is stained with the blood of their own brothers leads to the wilderness, not to the seat of their hope.

They are now face to face with their initial test. We must hold the light steady until they find themselves. And in the meantime, if it be possible, we must establish a peace that will justly define their place among the nations, remove all fear of their neighbors and of their former masters and enable them to live in

security and contentment when they have set their own affairs in order.

I, for one, do not doubt their purpose or their capacity. There are some happy signs that they know and will choose the way of self-control and peaceful accommodation. If they do, we shall put our aid at their disposal in every way that we can. If they do not, we must await with patience and sympathy the awakening and recovery that will assuredly come at last.

---

## President Wilson Speaks of Paramount Duty to Go to Paris

The President concluded his annual message before both houses of Congress on December 2 with these references to his journey to Paris to take part in the peace settlements:

I welcome this occasion to announce to the Congress my purpose to join in Paris the representatives of the Governments with which we have been associated in the war against the Central Empires for the purpose of discussing with them the main features of the treaty of peace. I realize the great inconveniences that will attend my leaving the country, particularly at this time, but the conclusion that it was my paramount duty to go has been forced upon me by considerations which I hope will seem as conclusive to you as they have seemed to me.

The allied Governments have accepted the bases of peace which I outlined to the Congress on the 8th of January last, as the Central Empires also have, and very reasonably desire my personal counsel in their

interpretation and application, and it is highly desirable that I should give it in order that the sincere desire of our Government to contribute without selfish purpose of any kind to settlements that will be of common benefit to all the nations concerned may be made fully manifest. The peace settlements which are now to be agreed upon are of transcendent importance, both to us and to the rest of the world, and I know of no business or interest which should take precedence of them. The gallant men of our armed forces on land and sea have conspicuously fought for the ideals which they knew to be the ideals of their country. I have sought to express those ideals; they have accepted my statements of them as the substance of their own thought and purpose, as the associated Gov-

ernments have accepted them; I owe it to them to see to it, so far as in me lies, that no false or mistaken interpretation is put upon them, and no possible effort omitted to realize them. It is now my duty to play my full part in making good what they offered their life's blood to obtain. I can think of no call to service which would transcend this.

I shall be in close touch with you and with affairs on this side of the water, and you will know all that I do. At my request the French and English Governments have absolutely removed the censorship of cable news which until within a fortnight they had maintained, and there is now no censorship whatever exercised at this end, except upon attempted trade communications with enemy countries. It has been necessary to keep an open wire constantly available between Paris and the Department of State, and another between France and the Department of War. In order that this might be done with the least possible interference with the other uses of the cables, I have temporarily taken over the control of both cables in order that they may be used as a single system. I did so at the advice of the most experienced cable officials, and I hope that the results will justify my hope that the news of the next few months may pass with the utmost freedom, and with the least possible delay

from each side of the sea to the other.

May I now hope, gentlemen of the Congress, that in the delicate tasks I shall have to perform on the other side of the sea, in my efforts truly and faithfully to interpret the principles and purposes of the country we love, I may have the encouragement and the added strength of your united support? I realize the magnitude and difficulty of the duty I am undertaking. I am poignantly aware of its grave responsibilities. I am the servant of the nation. I can have no private thought or purpose of my own in performing such an errand. I go to give the best that is in me to the common settlements which I must now assist in arriving at in conference with the other working heads of the associated Governments. I shall count upon your friendly countenance and encouragement. I shall not be inaccessible. The cables and the wireless will render me available for any counsel or service you may desire of me, and I shall be happy in the thought that I am constantly in touch with the weighty matters of domestic policy with which we shall have to deal. I shall make my absence as brief as possible, and shall hope to return with the happy assurance that it has been possible to translate into action the great ideals for which America has striven.

# The International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace

By LUCIA AMES MEAD

In April, 1915, the same month which saw the establishment at the Hague of the Central Organization for a Durable Peace, and before the institution of the League to Enforce Peace, a remarkable body of women from twelve belligerent and neutral countries gathered at the Hague and established The International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace. Their meetings lasted four days, during which the voters, numbering about 1,100 in all, drew up a series of resolutions which have had such striking resemblance to statements since published by President Wilson that they have been issued in parallel columns. It is known that he carefully studied and expressed approval of the resolutions.

This Congress had its initiative among European suffragists, who more than any other women were accustomed to international conventions and who had the international mind. The 47 Americans who attended as well as many others braved considerable difficulty in reaching Holland; most of the British delegates were unable to attend as, for the time being, all traffic, including mail, was suspended between England and Holland. Though meeting under difficulties when feeling was painful and intense, every tendency to emotionalism was religiously curbed and no one transgressed the agreement that there should be no discussion of the present war. One touching incident of the Congress was the share which German women took in the ovation to the Belgian delegates and their proposal to seat them on the platform.

The difficulties of language and of varying parliamentary procedure were overcome by women trained in international conventions to such conditions. Miss Jane Addams as chairman, conducted the intricate proceedings and was finally elected chairman of the permanent organization. Mrs. Fannie Fern

Andrews, the American member of the executive committee of the Organization for Durable Peace aided in drawing up the resolutions.

After the Congress, delegations, one led by Miss Addams, carried their resolutions to fourteen capitals and were received seriously and respectfully by the governments; in all they made thirty-five visits, as often they had more than one audience to allow further discussion. Everywhere they met members of parliaments and officials and gained a broader experience at the time than perhaps men could have obtained. They urged especially their resolution for a Neutral Conference to sit without diplomatic function and to offer continuous mediation without armistice. Said a Prime Minister of one of the larger countries, "Yours is the sanest proposal that has been brought to this office in the last six months."

Sections of the I.C.W.P.P. have now been established in twenty countries and there are committees in several others, including China and Japan. The section for the United States is the Woman's Peace Party. Its autonomous state branches sometimes adopt different names, the Massachusetts branch now entitling itself "League for Permanent Peace." No full international meeting has been held since the first Congress, but delegates from several countries met in Copenhagen in 1916 and delegates from neutral countries were to have convened in Holland early in 1918 but passports could not be obtained. The headquarters are at Amsterdam. Preparations are now in progress for the Women's Congress to be held at the time and place of the Peace Settlement Conference. The thirty-five delegates and alternates from America are already selected and are expected to start at once upon the announcement of place and date and to take part in



a Congress which they hope may voice the womanhood of the world. Their desire is to help bring to bear the influence of that half of humanity which they represent and which they believe should be a strong factor in that great general body of public opinion that must help in forming the decisions which will shape the future of mankind.

The American delegation has prepared the following tentative program for discussion at this Congress of Women:

### TENTATIVE PROGRAM

FOR DISCUSSION OF THE I. C. W. P. P. AT THE  
CONGRESS AFTER THE WAR

Presented by the American Section, 1917

#### *National Problems*

1. Democratic control of foreign policies through Parliaments selected by men and women . . . such policies to be based upon the recognition of moral obligation toward other states and the intention to advance the welfare of all peoples.

2. Proposal that only civilian delegates shall have the voting power at the Third Peace Conference at The Hague, the military delegates to have merely advisory functions. In general, members of legislative bodies, administrative officials, and non-official persons, as well as diplomats, to be selected. Women not to be debarred from this Conference nor from the Permanent International Conference (which it is hoped will be provided for by the Third Peace Conference).

3. Social, moral and political pressure by citizens on their own government for the attainment of specific measures discussed at the Congress of Women After the War.

4. All possible efforts to hasten the passing of animosities. Courses in schools and colleges on positive international ethics, on the principles of world organization including the relation of tariff barriers to the realization of world peace.

5. A persistent effort to extend the principles of democracy to all the departments of the government, and especially, so far as possible, to secure a change in the fundamental law, requiring a national plebiscite or referendum before declaration of war, or of a state of war, except in case of actual or imminent invasion of territory.

#### *International Problems*

I. What the *Peace Settlement Conference* should provide for:

1. A declaration of the Rights and Duties of Nations.

2. That no transference of territory shall take place without the consent of its men and women, nor autonomy and a democratic government be refused to any people.

3. A Concert or League of Nations open to all States.

4. A drastic reduction of rival armies and navies looking toward disarmament.

5. International protection for unorganized regions, such as the African dependencies.

6. New international adjustments giving adequate outlets or establishing changes of jurisdiction in the interests of justice, peace and of economic opportunity for all nations.

7. The international control of seas and of international waterways.

II. What the *Third Peace Conference* at the Hague should provide for. (It is hoped that this conference will be convened at an early date after the Peace Settlement Conference.)

1. A reconstruction of international law, based on the Declaration of Rights and Duties of Nations.

2. The continued stability of the Permanent Court of Arbitration.

3. A World Court of Justice (in addition to the Permanent Court of Arbitration, provided for in 1899) with jurisdiction over international disputes, not settled by negotiation, that are justiciable in character.

4. A Permanent International Council of Conciliation which shall not only examine specific cases of friction but shall study and report on existing situations and policies leading to war and shall recommend methods that might prevent war.

5. A Permanent International Conference, meeting regularly every two or three years, which shall formulate rules of international law to govern in the decisions of the World Court.

6. A Permanent Continuation Committee of the Conference to carry out the provisions of the International Conference, to study international relationships and to prepare for the International Conference.

7. Permanent International Administrative Commissions on matters of common international interest (such, for example, as the protection of unorganized regions, as referred to above, public health, waterways, immigration and emigration and protection of expatriated nationals, international finance and trade).

### III. Educational Foundations

An exposition by an international committee of the application of the universally recognized moral code to relationships among states and between citizens of different states. Such a code to be especially prepared for use in schools.

Nothing is more certain than that war can not end war. If this war is not, after all the agony, to bring a fruitless victory, one that can never make the world safe for democracy, the new world-order must not only be thought out by specialists but must be understood and made mandatory by the peoples before plenipotentiaries sign fatal compacts behind closed doors.

It is the chief function of the Woman's Peace Party at present to help arouse Amer-

icans to the importance of studying the principles involved in the establishment of a League of Nations and of the ultimate aims of the war as presented by that spokesman of the peoples of the world—President Woodrow Wilson.

*Postscript.* The above article prepared in January, 1918, presents the program as submitted to our foreign colleagues in 1917. Recently, a few changes have been made to bring it more up-to-date and to make it center around a League of Nations. It was originally supposed that the Peace Conference would meet in a neutral country. The fact that it meets in a belligerent country may perhaps alter somewhat the plans for the Conference.

L. A. M.

## PROPOSED CHANGE OF NAME FOR NEW YORK PEACE SOCIETY

The officers of the New York Peace Society are conducting (December, 1918) among the members a referendum upon a proposal to change the name of the Society from "Peace" to "International Justice." At a special meeting of the active members, December 8, the vote recorded was almost unanimous in favor of the change. Out of sixty votes only three were cast in favor of retaining the present name. If the other members by referendum ratify the action of the special meeting, the officers will proceed to have the change of name legalized, probably in the form "Society for International Justice."

The New York Peace Society has ardently supported the participation of the United States in the great war for human rights, which is now coming to a triumphant end. The Society has never swerved from its original purpose to promote among nations the constructive power of fraternal public opinion, but it has not agreed with the ideas of either the non-resistants or the Bolshevik socialists. It is common knowledge that the activities of these two groups during the great war for human rights have caused the American people to discredit the names and even the motives under which the old peace propaganda was conducted.

Many of the officers of the Society now

believe that work for cooperative unity among nations is not accurately described by the old names and titles. The true purpose was not—and is not—the mere prevention of war but the enthronement of Right among the nations. The only peace worth having will be a by-product of international justice. As President Wilson recently said, "International Justice is what we seek, not domestic safety merely."

"International Justice" is more descriptive of the ideal than the phrase, "League of Nations," for the latter is, at best, only one of the means by which the ideal may be realized. The League of Nations now exists and it should be made even more efficient in the future, but the questions about its form, character, limitations and powers will cause much discussion and uncertainty. On the other hand, concerning the need of contending for the triumph and supremacy of moral and social as well as legal justice in human affairs there can be no doubt whatever.

The best hope for human brotherhood is founded upon belief in the supremacy of moral and social justice. Without such a victory of righteousness, world-organization would become a screen for tyranny and peace would be another name for slavery.

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE,  
Secretary.

PERKINS LIBRARY

## MORAL FORCE WINS

"More than anything else the result of the war, as we behold it now, is proof of the supremacy of moral force which in the end downed the evil forces let loose upon the world. Even Bismarck knew this lesson of the world—knew that cynical evil could not forever override the power of Christian civilization, but William, the Kaiser, absorbed in his vast dream of military glory, over-

looked what Bismarck in his greater wisdom had understood. To-day, with the war ended and the forces of all those nations whose cause was one of right and justice and protection for the weak and equal opportunity for all dominant over all the battle-fronts where autocracy tried to crush its way, William and his kind know better—they have learned the law of moral force now."—*Elihu Root.*

Through the interest and generosity of a few friends *The World Tomorrow*\* is able to offer

## A PRIZE OF \$500

for an original essay on

# The League of Nations: Its Practicability and Its Need

The idea of the League of Nations has been raised to supreme importance by the statesmanship of President Wilson and by the common desire of plain people everywhere. There is, nevertheless, a necessary service to be rendered in the clear interpretation of this great ideal.

It will be the task of the writers of these essays to define the basic principles of the League and the lines along which it ought to be developed, remembering both the lessons of history and the limitations and possibilities of human nature. The essays must be constructive. We do not ask for elaborate discussion of machinery or of technical procedure. Primarily we seek new definitions, a new philosophy of the state, and new motives in human relations, of which the League of Nations should be the natural organized expression.

The following persons have kindly consented to act as judges:

JANE ADDAMS, Chairman of the International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace.

NORMAN ANGELL, Author and Publicist.

AMOS PINCHOT.

CHARLES A. BEARD, Director of the Bureau of Municipal Research, New York City.

FLORENCE KELLEY.

HENRY GODDARD LEACH, Secretary of the American Scandinavian Foundation.

The essays presented in this competition must not be shorter than four thousand nor longer than seven thousand words. Each essay must be typewritten, signed by a nom-de-plume, and accompanied by a sealed envelope giving the name and address of the competitor.

The World Tomorrow reserves the right to the first publication of the prize essay, but will release the copyright to the author within one month after publication.

Essays must be addressed to the Contest Editor of *The World Tomorrow* at 118 East 28th Street, New York City, and reach him there not later than January 31st, 1919.

\**The World Tomorrow* is a monthly magazine published by the Fellowship Press at 118 East 28th Street, New York City. Price, ten cents a copy or one dollar a year postpaid.



University of Pennsylvania Library  
Circulation Department

Please return this book as soon as you have  
finished with it. In order to avoid a fine it must  
be returned by the latest date stamped below.

UNIVERSITY OF  
PENNSYLVANIA  
JAN 9 1984  
LIBRARIES



N/1198/00677/8836X

940.92

M683

1727

v. 24

6951  
Q22.1715

no. 1-4

